

The Historical Background of "A Brief Statement"

By CARL S. MEYER

A *Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States*, adopted in 1932, is a product of the Middle Period in the history of that church. It reflects the theological concerns of that church body at that time and is conditioned by the relationships between the Missouri Synod and other Lutheran bodies during that period. Only to a lesser degree does it deal with general contemporary theological issues. Sociological and ecclesiological movements were not major factors which governed its formulation and adoption. However, without some understanding of the sociological, ecclesiological as well as the ecclesiastical and theological factors of this Middle Period of Missouri's History, *A Brief Statement* seems incomplete, unbalanced, warped.

What were the forces from within and from the outside which impinged on the Missouri Synod during this time? What was the Missourian reaction to them? Particularly, what were the developments within Lutheranism, and how did they influence Missouri? What factors in the internal history of the Missouri Synod ought to be considered to understand the historical background of *A Brief Statement*?

I

THE MIDDLE PERIOD

The "Middle Period in the History of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod" is the designation we have given to the

years 1887 to 1932, dividing the history of the Synod into 'three periods, 1847 to 1887, 1887 to 1932, 1932 to the present. It is this writer's opinion that the Missouri Synod is approaching the end of the third epoch and that her history can best be understood and evaluated by seeing her 115 years divided into three eras, each approximately the span of a generation. The year 1887, according to this periodization, would be the *terminus a quo* of the Middle Period; the year 1932, the *terminus ad quem*.

The year 1887, then, saw the end of one epoch in the history of the Missouri Synod and the beginning of another. Forty years had elapsed since its organization in Chicago, with the election of C. F. W. Walther as President.] Now this leader had passed on to his reward, his death occurring while the 20th convention of the Synod was in session."

in his presidential address to this triennial convention of Synod Schwan recognized: "Approximately with this year's meeting we are beginning a new period in the history of our Synod." ³

¹ Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1847, p. 16. [Full bibliographical information of official records is not given in this essay. All such records cited are in the Concordia Historical Institute.]

² Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1887, pp. 3 f.; *Der Lutheraner*, XLIII (May 15, 1887), 76 ff.

On Jan. 16, 1887, Walther's golden jubilee as pastor was observed. *Der Lutheraner*, XLIII (Feb. 1, 1887), 17.

³ H. C. Schwan, "Synodalrede," *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1887, p. 18.

This convention resolved, in agreement with the recommendation of the Electoral College, that Francis Pieper be the successor of the departed C. F. W. Walther, that he be offered the presidency of the Seminary, and that G. Scoeckhardt be elected as professor at Concordia Seminary.⁴ Subsequently in the same year A. L. Graebner was elected to the Sr. Louis faculty.⁵

This change in personnel at the theological seminary, involving the theological leadership of the Synod, is not the only factor, however, which points to a transition from one period to another.

In the year 1887 the *Progymnasium* at Milwaukee was taken over by the Synod,⁶ the first educational institution of higher education added to its system since 1857, when the *Lehrer-Seminar* was made a synodical institution and transferred from Milwaukee to Fort Wayne.⁷

In 1887 the resolution was passed to authorize the Foreign Mission Board to inaugurate a foreign mission, perhaps on the island of Ceylon,* although it was not until 1894 that Theodor Naether and Franz Mohn were commissioned for service in

India." In 1887, too, two new Districts were created, the Kansas District and the California-Oregon District,¹⁰ nothing new in practice but symbolic of the continued growth of the Synod.

By 1887 the Missouri Synod had reached its measure of growth in relationship to the total population of the country, for there would be no increase percentage-wise between 1887 and 1932 when compared with the over-all growth of the country.¹¹

By 1887 the *Gnadenwahlstreit* had simmered down, although echoes of this controversy reverberated, for instance, on the pages of *Lehre und Wehre* long after that date."

The membership of the Synodical Conference in 1887 consisted of the synods of Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.¹³ By

⁹ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1896, p. 79.

¹⁰ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1887, p. 81.

¹¹ *Infra*, p. 408.

¹² F[rancis] P[ieper], "Widerstehliche und unwiderstehliche Gnade," *Lehre und Wehre*, XXXIII (April and May 1887), 117 to 125; *ibid.*, XXXIII (June 1887), 160-167.

F[rancis] P[ieper], "Zum Thatsachenbestand des letzten Lehrstreits," *ibid.*, XXXIII (September 1887), 251-254.

F[rancis] P[ieper] in "Kirchlich-zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, XXXIII (June 1887), 176. In italics in this report.

Similarly in 1901 Theo. Buenger, "Etliche Züge aus der Geschichte der Missouri-Synode," *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, Iowa District, 1901, p. 90. wrote: "Mit dem Tode des seligen Dr. Walther am 7. Mai 1887 ist der erste Abschnitt der Geschichte unserer Synode zum Abschluss gekommen."

⁴ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1887, p. 30.

⁵ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1890, p. 30.

⁶ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1887, pp. 42, 43.

⁷ Carl S. Meyer, "Teacher Training in the Missouri Synod to 1864," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, XXX (Fall 1957), 97 to 110; *ibid.*, XXX (Winter 1957), 157-166.

⁸ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1887, p. 66.

F[rancis] P[ieper], "Das lutherische und das Ohio'sche Geheimnis in der Lehre von der Bekehrung und Gnadenwahl," *ibid.*, XXXIV (February 1888), 33-42.

F[rancis] P[ieper], "Ist es wirklich lutherische Lehre, dass des Menschen Bekehrung und Seligkeit nicht allein von Gottes Gnade, sondern in gewisser Hinsicht auch von dem Verhalten des Menschen abhängig sei?" *ibid.*, XXXVII (October 1891), 289-294; *ibid.*, XXXVII (November 1891), 321-328; *ibid.*, XXXVII (December 1891), 361-365; *ibid.*, XXXVIII (March 1892), 65-70; *ibid.*, XXXVIII (April 1892), 104-106; *ibid.*, XXXVIII (May 1892), 129-132.

This list could be amplified by listing articles from subsequent years.

¹³ *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1888, pp. 3, 4.

1932 two small synods had been added, and the Minnesota Synod had merged with the Wisconsin Synod," yet there had been no radical transformation in the character of that federation during the 45 years.

These are factors that point to the year 1887 as the beginning of an epoch in the history of the Missouri Synod, an epoch which ended in the year 1932. This is said in the realization that the periodization of history is hazardous. It might be urged, for instance, that the dates 1893 and 1935 or 1887 and 1935 would be better termini.

The year 1887 saw not only the adoption of *A Brief Statement*,¹⁵ it also marked the second time that the *Proceedings* of the Missouri Synod were published in contradistinction to the *Verhandlungen*.¹⁶ The change in title already in 1929 is indicative that by and large the language transition had been almost completed, a transition in process since 1911. The organization of the English Evangelical Lutheran Conference of Missouri had taken place already in 1872;¹⁷ in 1887 the Missouri Synod declined the petition of a number of English Lutheran congregations to form a separate English Mission of the Missouri Synod;¹⁸ in 1888 the Constitution of the General English Evangelical Lutheran Conference of Missouri and Other States was adopted;¹⁹ in 1911 the English Synod

became the English District of the Missouri Synod.²⁰ These organizational aspects do not describe the language transition; they merely illustrate a few specific developments. The publication of *A Brief Statement* in a bilingual edition is another illustration of the language transition.

In 1837 Pieper, commenting on the future of the Missouri Synod after its first 50 years, acknowledged the necessity of working in the English language. Three fourths of the candidates were prepared, he said, to work in the English language, if necessary. Among the 180 students at St. Louis preparing for the ministry only 26 were foreign-born. The internal growth of the Synod pointed to the need of continued German as *Kirchensprache*; the main task of the Missouri Synod for the next decades would be in German, even though immigration had virtually ceased.²¹ In 1929 he spoke of the need of a *zweisprachiges Ministerium*, a topic which had occupied the convention of the Synod.²² Not the perpetuation of German culture but the propagation of the Lutheran heritage was the task of the church, whether in German or in English.²³

The "English" question was troublesome. If a minority in a congregation did not understand English, a majority did not have the right to deprive them of German services. English missions were needed.

¹⁴ *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1932, pp. 3, 4.

¹⁵ *Proceedings*, No. Synod, 1932, p. 154.

¹⁶ The 1930 reports of the Synodical Conference were published as *Verhandlungen*; the 1932, as *Proceedings*.

¹⁷ [C. F. W.] W[alther], "Eine freie Konferenz englischer und deutscher Lutheraner in Missouri," *Der Lutheraner*, XXVIII (Sept. 1, 1872), 180—183.

¹⁸ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1887, p. 69.

¹⁹ The conference became a synod in 1891.

²⁰ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1911, pp. 31 to 40; *Reports and Memorials*, 1911, pp. 98—100.

²¹ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, XLIII (May 1897), 156, 157.

²² F[rancis] P[ieper], "Unsere diesjährige Delegatensynode in River Forest," *ibid.*, LXXV (December 1929), 355, 358.

²³ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Vorwort," *ibid.*, XXXVII (January 1891), 4, 5.

"Wenn ich nur meine deutsche Kirche behalte, dann will ich gerne Opfer für die englischen Glaubensbrüder bringen." ²⁴ Similar sentiments were voiced throughout Synod, although there were many congregations in which the language question caused much bitterness and hard feelings. The transition had been made or was well advanced in all except isolated culture islands by 1932.

In 1932 recognition was taken of the labors of the late F. Pieper, F. Bente, and George Mezger.²⁵ Another generation had passed; another epoch in the history of the Missouri Synod had come to a close. F. Pfotenhauer served one more term as President of the church body; in 1935 he became "Honorary President."²⁶ But L. Fuerbringer remained active for almost another decade, a fact that protests against little historians making too pat periodizations of history.²⁷

The convention of 1932 was the "depression Synod." "Es mangelt an Geld" was the recurrent song of the convention and "the present economic conditions" was the reason given for declining requests for new buildings, professorships, curtailing mission work, both at home and abroad, and so on.²⁸

In 1932 the required vicarage for theological students at St. Louis was inaugu-

rated,²⁹ as was the summer school for Lutheran teachers at Concordia Teachers College in River Forest,³⁰ the old *Kaffeemuehle* in Springfield had been torn down;³¹ and less than 4 per cent of Synod's pastors still preached against dancing as a sinful amusement."³² The first report of the Survey Committee — forerunner of the Board for Higher Education — was acted on in this year.³³ The first report of the Board of Christian Education (established in 1929), too, came to the 1932 convention.³⁴ The office of District School Superintendent was sanctioned.³⁵ None of these events is large enough in itself to mark an end of an epoch. Taken together they are indicative that one period of the Missouri Synod was giving way to another.

Brief reference must be made to the fact that during this period the Missouri Synod experienced the first trend toward a centralization of ecclesiological function. In 1908 the *Allgemeine Aufsichtsbehörde*, consisting of three men, was authorized.³⁶ Three years later the President was made a full-time official of the Synod.³⁷ In 1917 the new constitution authorized the establishment of the Board of Directors."³⁸ Then

²⁹ Ibid., p. 32.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 101.

³¹ Ibid., p. 32. *Kaffeemuehle* was the affectionate name bestowed by students of Concordia Seminary, Springfield, Ill., on one of its original buildings.

³² Ibid., p. 106.

³³ Ibid., pp. 80-85.

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 85-100.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 158-160.

³⁶ *Proceedings, Mo. Synod*, 1908, pp. 61 to 63.

³⁷ *Proceedings, Mo. Synod*, 1911, pp. 133, 134, 192.

³⁸ *Proceedings, Mo. Synod*, 1917, pp. 84 to 92 (English ed., pp. 43-52).

²⁴ C. Z. [Carl Zorn], "Zur Sprachenfrage," *Der Lutheraner*, LXIX (May 10, 1892), 78, 79.

²⁵ *Proceedings, Mo. Synod*, 1932, p. 244; cf. p. 31 and pp. 28 f.

²⁶ *Proceedings, Mo. Synod*, 1935, pp. 212, 213.

²⁷ *Proceedings, Mo. Synod*, 1932, p. 29.

²⁸ See, e.g., *Proceedings, 1932*, pp. 34, 49, 55, 59, 61, 115, et al. "Under prevailing economic conditions" and "under present conditions" were other phrases used.

in 1932 came a realignment of boards and committees, a consolidation and strengthening of the structure.³⁹ The trend must be noted, at least, in this sketch of trends and movements within the Missouri Synod during the Middle Period.

Enough has been said to justify or rationalize the dates **1887** and 1932 as the termini of the Middle Period of the history of the Missouri Synod. In doing that, we have pointed or alluded to some of the movements and trends during that period, such as the language transition. The German character of the first period carried over to the Middle Period. Some of the immigrants who came in the 1880s and 1890s were fiercely patriotic, imbued with the spirit that engendered the formation of the first *Reich*. They brought with them a high regard for *Deutschtum* and thereby created problems for the churches.⁴⁰

However, during this Middle Period of Missouri's history the Missouri Synod was transformed from an immigrant church to a native-born church. The maximum number of persons living in the United States who had been born in Germany was reached in 1890.⁴¹ By 1910, 20 years later, the maximum for those of German parentage was reached.⁴² Thus about 1887, or better between 1850 and 1914, the *Völ-*

kerwanderung of the 19th century ⁴³ became a major factor in the history of the Missouri Synod.

Immigration from Germany in 1839, the year the Saxons reached Perry County, Mo., had been only 21,028. A record number of immigrants from Germany was reached in 1854, seven years after the organization of the Missouri Synod and the year in which the young Synod found it necessary for organizational purposes to subdivide into four Districts.⁴⁴ In that year, 15,009 German immigrants set foot on American soil, a yearly total not reached again until 1882, with 250,630 immigrants. Ten years later, in 1892, there were 119,168 German immigrants, another high point. Between 1887 and 1932 there were only four years in which 'German immigrants exceeded 100,000 a year, and these were between 1887 and 1892 (inclusive). A low point was reached in 1898 with only 17,111 German immigrants. Between 1887 and 1914 (inclusive) an average (mean) of about 48,270 German immigrants a year entered this country.⁴⁵ These were by no means all Lutherans, but there were Lutherans among them in large enough numbers to affect the Missouri Synod also. About 1890 the character of

³⁹ *Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1332*, pp. 9^o f., 110 f., 160.

⁴⁰ See Carl S. Meyer, "Lutheran Immigrant Churches Face the **Problems** of the Frontier," *Church History*, XXIX (December 1960), 452-455.

⁴¹ E. P. Hutchison, *Immigrants and Their Children, 1850-1950* (for the Social Science Research Council in co-operation with the U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1956), p. 4.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁴³ *Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1874*, p. 63; the phrase was used 'in the report of the Commission for Emigrant Missions in New York. In this report the question was asked: "Was wie insonderheit unsre theure lutherische Kirche in diesem Lande ohne die Einwanderung?"

⁴⁴ *Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1854*, pp. 17, 19 f.

⁴⁵ *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957*, prepared by the U. S. Bureau of the Census with the co-operation of the Social Science Research Council (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960), **C-94**, pp. 56, 57.

the immigration changed; this change had a partial effect on the Missouri Synod.

Table I makes it evident that the Missouri Synod membership fell slightly behind the increase in the population of the country as a whole in the Middle Period.⁴⁶

Table I

Year	Population of the USA	Membership of Mo. Syn.	MO _{Syn.} membership of USA per cent population
1890	62,947,714	531,357	.0084
1900	75,994,575	728,240	.00963
1910	91,972,266	878,654	.00955
1920	105,710,620	1,009,982	.00955
1930	122,775,046	1,163,666	.00946

It is true, but nevertheless, it can be very deceptive to say that between 1890 and 1926 the membership of the Missouri Synod increased 133.24 per cent, and that its yearly increase was 3.7 per cent in this period.⁴⁷ In this same period the population of the country as a whole increased by 185 per cent.⁴⁸ Moreover, 22 per cent of the population of the country was churchd in 1890; of this number the Missouri Synod made up 3.8 per cent. But in 1930, 43 per cent of the population of the country was churchd; the Missouri Synod

made up only 2.2 per cent of this number. In the increase of population the Missouri Synod was barely holding its own, if that; it was not increasing as rapidly as was the over-all church membership of the country.

It was not that the immigration was disregarded by the Missouri Synod. Far from that. Already in 1869 Stephanus Keyl had become *Emigranten Missionar*, a position he held almost up to his end on Dec. 15, 1905.⁴⁹ In 1890 there were immigrant agents in New York and Baltimore as well as in Hamburg and Bremen in Germany?" In 14 years the Iowa District, by way of illustration, had increased from 19,072 in 1886 to 35,426 in 1900, an 83 per cent increase.⁵¹ The constant need for *Reiseprediger* remained with the Synod. In 1880 F. Pfotenhauer, later to serve the Synod as President (1911—1935), accepted a call as candidate. In 1884 his parish consisted of five congregations and five preaching places." Pleas were made in the church periodicals, in synodical conventions, and in the conventions of the Districts for young men to serve in the fields almost invariably described as "white unto harvest." ⁵³ F. Pfotenhauer wrote of this expansion in the Northwest:

⁴⁹ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1908, p. 84.

⁵⁰ *Amerikanischer Kalender für deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1890* (St. Louis: Lutherischer Concordia-Verlag, 1890), pp. 28 f.

⁵¹ The o . Buenger, "Etliche Züge aus der Geschichte der Missouri-Synode," *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, Iowa District, 1901, p. 90.

⁵² *Statistisches Jahrbuch, 1884*, p. 48. Of 14 men serving in Dakota in 1884, only one served as few as three congregations.

⁵³ F. Pf [otenhauer], "Vortrag über Innere Mission," *Lehre und Wehre*, LI (August 1905), 353-358; A. G[raebner], "Unsere 'Innere Mission,'" *Der Lutheraner*, L (Jan. 30, 1894), 22, 23; *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1902, pp. 65-74; et al.

⁴⁵ The figures for the U. S. A. were taken from Edwin O. Goldfield, ed. *Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1960* (81st ed.; Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960), table 1, p. 5.

The figures for the Missouri Synod are from Erwin L. Lueker, ed. *Lutheran Cyclopedia* (Saint Louis: Concotdia Publishing House, 1954), p. 629.

⁴⁷ The data are from O. M. Norlie and G. L. Kieffer, eds. *The Lutheran World Almanac and Encyclopedia, 1931—1933* (New York: National Lutheran Council, 1932), p. 393.

⁴⁸ *Historical Statistics*, A-2, p. 7. The estimated population on July 1, 1890, was 63,056,000; on July 1, 1926, 117,399,000.

The growth of our Synod in the Northwest now [1880] assumed unlooked for dimensions. By the providence of God several factors worked together to bring about this growth. The newly organized [Minnesota and Dakota] District carried on its mission work in a systematic way. At its conventions a detailed report was given of the work done, and this was followed by thorough deliberations. The Board of Missions was earnestly devoted to this worthy cause and provided the missionaries with the necessary means of support, though these could be supplied only moderately. The conferences of the District tried to find ways and means for opening up new territories. . . . The number of graduates from our seminaries that entered the work of this mission District increased from year to year. These young men took hold of the work filled with enthusiasm and energy. They traversed the prairies in all directions and extended the work done by the first pioneers.⁵⁴

But the demands for men constantly exceeded the supply. In 1890 there were 105 calls for 68 candidates (40 from St. Louis and 28 from Springfield).⁵⁵ In 1909 there were only 96 men available (61 from Saint Louis, 35 from Springfield) for 180 calls.⁵⁶ In 1914 there were 122 calls for 116 candidates (93 from St. Louis and 23 from Springfield).⁵⁷ The vast demands of the *Innere Mission* — home missions — harassed the officials and boards and faculties

of the seminaries. By the end of the period, however, *Reiseprediger* had in general given way to missionaries who were stationed in urban areas.”

This means that by 1932 there was a notable trend toward urbanization also within the Missouri Synod. In 1932 out of 3,512 congregations, 376 Missouri Synod churches were located in 20 of the largest cities within the U. S. A.⁵⁸ The statistics are not exact enough to determine how many of the 1,424 congregations in 1887 were in cities. Among German immigrants in general, it may be noted, there was a readiness to settle on homesteads in the earlier years; in the later period Germans tended toward nonrural occupations.⁶⁰ These trends had important bearings on the Missouri Synod in the composition of her congregations. That Missouri Synod congregations in another generation have varied sociological backgrounds needs no documentation. The shift was evident already in 1932.

In 1932 the third generation within the Missouri Synod was coming to the fore. Marcus Lee Hansen had formulated what he calls “the principle of third generation interest.” He says: “The theory is derived from the almost universal phenomenon that what the son wishes to forget, the

⁵⁸ See, e. g., *Our Home Mission*, IX (September 1933), 11. Thirty men served 105 places.

⁵⁹ *Statistical Yearbook, 1932*, p. 142. Cf. also the parochial reports. The count was made by me.

By 1926 the Missouri Synod was 54.6 per cent urban. A report from the U.S. Census of *Religious Bodies, 1926*, in *Theological Monthly*, XX (May 1929), 142.

⁶⁰ Hutchison, *Immigrants and Their Children, 1850—1950*, pp. 107-111.

⁵⁴ F. Pfothner, “The Opening Up of the Great Northwest,” *Ebenezer: Reviews of the Work of the Missouri Synod During Three Quarters of a Century*, ed. W. H. T. Dau (Augmented ed.; St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1922), p. 338.

⁵⁵ *Der Lutheraner*, XLVI (July 29, 1890), 129.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, LXV (June 1, 1909), 167.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, LXX (May 26, 1914), 174.

grandson wishes to remember.”⁶¹ The second generation of Missourians did not wish to forget their theology, whatever defections there may have been. However, by the early 1930s there was another generation which numbered many who wanted to maintain the rheology of the founding fathers. Since the stream of immigration continued until after 1900, there were second- and third-generation immigrants simultaneously within the Synod, a factor which may account for some of the tensions of the 1930s within this church body. The phenomenon, at any rate, deserves a much fuller investigation than that presented here.

The closing of the frontier in 1890, too,⁶² must be taken into consideration in giving a detailed analysis of the history of the Missouri Synod. What this meant for the Middle Period of her history is difficult to evaluate. The influence of the frontier, however, must not be overlooked.”

The declining importance of immigration after 1892 or so can be seen in the reports of the Immigrant Commission.

⁶¹ M. L. Hansen, *The Problem of the Third Generation Immigrant* (Augustana Historical Society Publications; Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana Historical Society, 1938), p. 9.

⁶² Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1920), developed the frontier thesis in a paper to the American Historical Association in 1893.

⁶³ The frontier thesis has been applied to the churches in America by Peter G. Mode, *Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History* (Menasha, Wis.: Banta Publishing Co., 1921), and especially by William Warren Sweet, *Religion in the Development of American Culture, 1765—1840* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), and *The Story of Religion in America* (New York: Harper & Brothefs, 1939).

By 1911 this committee reported: "Zwar ist die deutsche Einwanderung, namentlich aus Deutschland, gegen früher sehr zurückgegangen . . ." ⁶⁴ By 1917 the report read: "Das Pilgerhaus ist verkauft." ⁶⁵ It marked, in a sense, the end of an epoch.

This period, it must be remembered, had begun in 1839 and was not quite at an end in 1917. Other immigrants were to come in the 1920s and again in the late 1940s and in the 1950s. Immigration had played an important part in the development of the Missouri Synod. During the Middle Period it had absorbed most of the mission efforts of the Synod. By 1932 the transition to a large extent had been made. World War I cut off immigration, and restrictions after the war curtailed it greatly. In 1932 these restrictions on immigration by the United States Government in part prompted a move to discontinue the Immigrant Mission entirely; the Synod, however, transferred this mission in New York City to the Atlantic District.”

The consolidation of various mission boards and missions, too, was determined in 1932, and the office of Secretary of Missions was created. Foreign language missions were transferred to the Districts in which the work was being done.⁶⁷

Mission work among the Indians belongs to the heritage of the Missouri Synod, going back to the Loehe colonists in the Saginaw (Michigan) Valley. The last report of the Board for Indian Missions to the Synod was made in 1932; this board was eliminated, and the work of this board

⁶⁴ Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1911, p. 88.

⁶⁵ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1917, p. 56.

⁶⁶ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1932, pp. 148 to 150.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 110, 111.

was transferred to the Districts "having Indian communities in their midst," with the encouragement "to give them their fostering care."⁶⁸ Moves of this kind, with their broader implications, show that the end of an epoch had been reached.

The growth and development of the Missouri Synod during the Middle Period is reflected in the expansion of its school system for training professional workers in the church. Here the period from 1887 to 1926 is marked off clearly.

In 1887 four institutions for professional training were under the control of the Missouri Synod: Concordia Seminary, St. Louis; Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Ill.; Concordia Teachers College, Addison, Ill.; and Concordia College, Fort Wayne, Ind.⁶⁹ In 1887 the Concordia-*Progymnasium* in Milwaukee was added to the synodical schools.⁷⁰ In 1894 the second teacher-training institution was opened under synodical auspices in Seward, Nebr.⁷¹ By resolution of Synod a *Progymnasium* was also begun in 18% in the St. Paul-Minneapolis area.⁷² In 1896 the *Progymnasium* at Concordia, Mo., was accepted by the Missouri Synod as a synodical school; 73 so, too, the school at Nepheran, N. Y.⁷⁴ A resolution of Synod directed Districts to found new schools only after permission

had been granted by the Synod.⁷⁵ In 1905 authorization was given for establishing a school in California.⁷⁶ In 1708 St. John's College in Winfield, Kans., was finally accepted as a gift from the English Missouri Synod.⁷⁷

The general trend in the first decade of the 20th century was for District ownership of schools, with subsidy from the Synod. Concordia College in New Orleans, La., was founded by a College Association in 1904, which received a synodical subsidy, beginning in 1905,⁷⁸ but was taken over by the Southern District in 1906, with continued subsidy from the Synod.⁷⁹ In 1917 the institution was closed because of decreased enrollment.⁸⁰ In the meanwhile the California school continued under District auspices until it was taken over by Synod in 1923.⁸¹ In that same year the institution at Portland, Oreg., was taken over.⁸² It had been under District auspices since 1905; since 1911 it had received subsidy from the Synod.⁸³ In that year, too, Concordia College of Conover, N. C., became the property of the Missouri Synod.⁸⁴ Not until 1920 was the school in Porto Alegre, Brazil, subsidized by Synod since 1908 as an institution of the

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 139; see pp. 135—139, 111.

⁶⁹ *Proceedings*, MO. Synod, 1887, pp. 27, 41.

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 42, 43.

⁷¹ *Proceedings*, MO. Synod, 1896, pp. 56 to 59.

⁷² Ibid., pp. 65—69.

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 69—72.

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 72, 73.

The actual dates of organization of the schools are: Bronxville, 1881; Milwaukee, 1881; Concordia, Mo., 1883; Winfield, 1893; Seward, 1894.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 74.

⁷⁶ *Proceedings*, MO. Synod, 1905, pp. 54 to 56; the school was opened in 1906.

⁷⁷ *Proceedings*, MO. Synod, 1908, pp. 60, 61.

⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 53, 54.

⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 53, 54; *Proceedings*, MO. Synod, 1911, pp. 75, 76; *Proceedings*, MO. Synod, 1914, pp. 62, 63.

⁸⁰ *Proceedings*, MO. Synod, 1917, pp. 40, 41.

⁸¹ *Proceedings*, MO. Synod, 1923, pp. 71, 72.

⁸² Ibid., pp. 73-75.

⁸³ *Proceedings*, MO. Synod, 1911, pp. 79 to 82.

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 34.

Brazilian District,⁸⁵ taken over by the Synod.⁸⁶

In 1920 Synod resolved to build a school in Western Canada, to be opened in September 1921 with a *Sexta* class.⁸⁷ Then in 1923 a *Gymnasium* was voted for Texas by Synod.⁸⁸ The Teachers College was moved to River Forest in 1913.⁸⁹ With the relocation and new housing of Concordia Seminary in Clayton, Mo., in 1926,⁹⁰ one epoch in ministerial education of the Missouri Synod came to an end. Missouri had expanded her system of professional training schools during the Middle Period, a system which helped her maintain her stability.

During this epoch attempts were made within the Missouri Synod to supply secondary education for its laity. Walther College, the successor of the *Buergerschule* in St. Louis, flourished from 1888 to 1917. Its pioneering character is of significance in the educational history of the Missouri Synod.⁹¹ The high schools in Milwaukee (1903),⁹² Chicago (1909),⁹³ and Fort

Wayne (1916), Immanuel at Greensboro (1903), Bethany College in Mankato (1911) and the Lutheran High School and Business College in Deshler, Nebr. (1913), had their beginnings at this time.⁹⁴ The establishment of community Lutheran secondary schools in the first decade of the 20th century constitutes a trend, not to be duplicated for another generation.

Toward the close of this period, too, in 1925, Valparaiso University was acquired by an association within the Missouri Synod.⁹⁵

The establishment of Lutheran secondary schools was due in part to the urbanization and prosperity of the Missouri Synod Lutherans. It was due in part to the system of parish schools fostered by the Synod. It is true, between 1887 and 1932 the parish schools of the Missouri Synod underwent a transformation. "Begun as agencies to transmit the teachings of the church in the language of the old Fatherland, they became for many simply agencies to transmit their German heritage. This became evident from the large num-

⁸⁵ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1908, p. 78.

⁸⁶ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1920, pp. 74 to 78.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 78-80.

⁸⁸ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1923, pp. 84 to 85.

⁸⁹ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1914, p. 28.

⁹⁰ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1926, pp. 29, 30; also see *ibid.*, pp. 25, 26.

⁹¹ Arthur O. Leutheusser, "The Founding, Rise, and Extinction of Walther College," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, XXXI (July 1958), 33-38.

⁹² E. H. Buetger, "The History of the Lutheran High School in Milwaukee, Wis.," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, XXXIII (January 1961), 107-120; *ibid.*, XXXIV (April 1961), 5-17.

⁹³ Elsa M. Birkner, "Lutheran Secondary Ed-

ucation in Chicago," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, XXXII (October 1959), 79 to 86.

⁹⁴ John F. Stach, "The Period of Assimilation, 1894-1914," One Hundred Years of *Christian Education*, ed. Arthur C. Repp (Fourth Yearbook; River Forest, Ill.: Lutheran Education Association, 1947), pp. 164-166.

⁹⁵ John Strietelmeier, *Valparaiso's First Century* (Valparaiso: Valparaiso University Press, 1959).

⁹⁶ In the L. E. A. Yearbook cited in footnote 94 the period from 1847 to 1864 in the educational history of the Missouri Synod is called The Period of Planting; the period from 1864 to 1894 is called The Period of Expansion; from 1894 to 1914, The Period of Assimilation; and that from 1914 to 1947, The Period of Integration.

ber of *Fremde*, nonmembers, in the schools.⁹⁷ The Foreword of the 1871 *Schulblatt* said: "We want to further a *German* school setting in this our new fatherland."⁹⁸ Yet the answer given to the question, "What should move us to erect Christian schools and use them faithfully for our children?" included six points, among which there was one "our love to our Fatherland [the U. S. A.]." The command of God to the parents, the church, the pastors, love for the children, and love for "God's Word and our precious church" were other reasons cited.⁹⁹

World War I caused some of these schools to be closed because they were "German" schools. The "German" school at Schumm, Ohio, e. g., 'was dynamited and was closed for a period of almost a year. Other schools were closed permanently. The congregations of the Synod had 2,216 schools in 1912;¹⁰⁰ in 1922 there were 1,345 schools.¹⁰¹ This number increased by only 32 schools in ten years, for by 1932 there were no more than 1,377 schools.¹⁰² Those that remained, however, were the stronger as educational institutions, since they were forced to re-examine their standards, and in part at least, to reorganize their curricula.¹⁰³ There are indications that by

1932 a new appreciation of the objectives, the values, and the mission of the parish schools had set in among the members of the Missouri Synod and a new epoch had set in.¹⁰⁴

During the Middle Period the members of the Missouri Synod had to face serious legal threats to their schools. In Illinois the Edwards Law, the Bennett Law in Wisconsin, and the Starkwell and Knudsen bills of Minnesota were directly or indirectly aimed against the parochial schools. This crisis, around 1890, enlisted the forces of the Missouri Synod, the Wisconsin Synod, and the Synodical Conference in support of the schools.¹⁰⁵ It brought about good. Internal improvements resulted:

1. More efficient training of teachers.
2. Better support of the schools on the

book of the Lutheran Education Association; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951).

¹⁰⁴ L. G. Bickel, "The Period of Integration, X914-1947," One *Hundred Years of Christian Education*, p. 198: "Because of a great world disaster our people were forcibly led to re-examine their set of social and spiritual values, with the result that, *having* faced the choice, they became stronger in their convictions both in the spiritual realm and in their mission and duty toward their children. At the dawn of another era, God appears to have prepared His people for great things for Him."

¹⁰⁵ *Proceedings, Mo. Synod*, 1890, pp. 83 to 86; *Proceedings, Mo. Synod, Wisconsin District*, 1889, pp. 51-53; *Proceedings, Mo. Synod, Wisconsin District*, 1891, pp. 60-84; *Proceedings, Mo. Synod, Illinois District*, 1889, pp. 114 to 117; *Proceedings, Synodical Conference*, 1890, pp. 35-42; Stach, "The Period of Assimilation, 1894-1914," One *Hundred Years of Christian Education*, pp. 137-140; Walter A. Beck, *Lutheran Elementary Schools in the United States* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1939), pp. 227-250; Anson Phelps Stokes, *Church and State in the United States* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), II, 737.

⁹⁷ Walter F. Wolbrecht, "The Period of Expansion, 1864-1894," One *Hundred Years of Christian Education*, p. 82.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 119.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 76, with reference to *Proceedings, Mo. Synod, Iowa District*, 1882, pp. 10 ff.; the essayist was Geo. Mezger.

¹⁰⁰ *Statistisches Jahrbuch*, 1912, p. 177.

¹⁰¹ *Statistical Yearbook*, 1922, p. 132.

¹⁰² *Statistical Yearbook*, 1932, p. 138.

¹⁰³ Arthur L. Miller, *Educational Administration and Supervision of the Lutheran Schools of the Missouri Synod, 1914-1950* (8th Year-

part of the congregation in the matter of books and other essential supplies.

3. An upward extension of the elementary school system.
4. Increased use of the English language.
5. More prayers on the part of the congregations for the continued existence of the schools.¹⁰⁶

After the First World War other attempts were made to curtail the work of the parochial schools. In Nebraska, Michigan, and in Oregon laws were passed that threatened the parish schools.¹⁰⁷ Again the forces of the Synod, notably the American Luther League under the leadership of J. C. Baur, joined forces with others to bring about the eventual defeat of these measures. The decisions of the Supreme Court in the Oregon Case (1924) and the *Meyer v. Nebraska* case (1923) were of the greatest importance for the furtherance of the church schools within the Missouri Synod as well as within other church bodies.¹⁰⁸ The good resulting from the crisis of the early 1890s was repeated in a large measure in the early 1920s; another generation within the Missouri Synod learned to re-evaluate and appreciate its schools.

Part-time programs of Christian education, too, were furthered during this period.

¹⁰⁶ Stach, p. 140, with reference to Beck, p. 261.

¹⁰⁷ Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1920, pp. 234, 235; Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1923, pp. 152, 153; J. P. Meyer, "Der Kampf um unser Schulwesen," Proceedings, Synodical Conference, 1922, pp. 1—25; Bickel, "The Period of Integration, 1914—1947," One Hundred Years of Christian Education, 198; Beck, pp. 324-343; Stokes, II, 733-744; Fred Vonderlage, "Saving the Private Schools: A Study of Pressure Group Influence on State Referenda in Michigan and Oregon," Unpublished Master's Thesis, 1959, Washington University, St. Louis.

¹⁰⁸ Bickel, p. 198.

Sunday schools,¹⁰⁹ Saturday schools, summer schools were fostered.¹¹⁰ Vacation Bible schools were making their appearance by 1932, e.g., in Rochester, Minn.

These, then, are some of the trends and movements, illustrated by specific events, of the Middle Period of the history of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod. The period from 1887 to 1932 saw this church body changed from an immigrant group to a predominantly native-born group, second- and third-generation children of immigrants. In this period the Missouri Synod faced the overwhelming demands of *Innere Mission*, a characteristic which this period shared with the first period. During this Middle Period the Synod began her foreign missions. She made the transition from a German to a predominantly English church body. She experienced a trend toward urbanization. She engaged in several struggles for her parochial schools, which she retained and strengthened. She expanded her system of professional preparatory schools. She even saw the beginnings of a gradual centralization of synodical functions. Doctrinal concerns, a concern for the *reine Lehre*, were still extremely strong, particularly in the face of liberal theology, higher criticism, theories of evolution, the social gospel, fundamentalism, and dispensationalism. Conversion and election, the "Four Points," open questions, the Scriptures, were major questions in her relation with other Lutheran bodies. It is to some of these doctrinal concerns to which we now turn.

¹⁰⁹ Martin A. Haendschke, "The Historical Development of the Sunday School Movement in The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, 1961, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

¹¹⁰ Bickel, pp. 200-204.

II

MAJOR THEOLOGICAL MOVEMENTS
IN AMERICA, 1887—1932

The men of this generation of the Middle Period in the history of the Missouri Synod were doing battle "gegen das Pabstthum, gegen Unglauben, gegen Schwärmerie und falsches Lutherthum."¹ They believed that polemics were necessary, didactic, edifying, wholesome, and comforting." Defense of false doctrine meant a falsification of the principle of Scripture:

In the "Vorwort" to the *Lehre und Wehre* for the first number of the 20th century, Pieper asked the question, "What does the church need for the 20th century?" His answer was simple — the Gospel, the old Gospel, the Gospel of God, the Gospel of the grace of God, the Gospel of peace, the everlasting Gospel.²

The accent on *reine Lehre* was an accent on the Gospel. "Our Synod will retain the pure Gospel and God will permit our Synod to grow and prosper only if she is zealous in her stipulated task, namely, in the perpetuation and dissemination of the pure Gospel."³

¹ [Martin] G[uenther], "Vorwort," *Der Lutheraner*, XLVI (Jan. 1, 1890), 1.

² G. St[oeckhardt], "Vorwort," *Lehre und Wehre*, LI (January 1905), 2, 3: "Ja, die Polemik ist nothwendig. . . Die Polemik, das ist schriftgemässe Polemik, ist lehrreich. . . Die Polemik, rechte Polemik ist erbaulich. . . Polemik, rechte Polemik ist heilsam und tröstlich."

³ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Die Vertheidigung falscher Lehre zieht die Fälschung des Schriftprinzips nach sich," *ibid.*, LI (January 1905), 9—18.

⁴ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Vorwort," *ibid.*, XLII (January 1901), 1—5.

⁵ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Das Evangelium oder die reine Lehre von der Rechtfertigung die Quelle der rechten Begeisterung für alle Arbeit

Protestantism as a whole in the 19th century was faced with the aftermath of the Enlightenment and with continued Rationalism. Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768 to 1834) and Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772—1834) in the first part of the century found the heart of religion in the realm of *Gefühl*, or emotion, a sense and taste of the Infinite, the indispensable friend and advocate of morality." In the course of the century Biblical criticism came to the fore. Wilhelm Martin Leberrecht de Wette (1780—1849) was preceded by Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694 to 1768), Johann Salomo Semler (1725 to 1791), and Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752—1827).⁷ Heinrich Georg August Ewald (1803—1875) produced his seven-volume *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* by 1859, which was criticized by conservatives and radical critics alike.⁸ Johann Karl Wilhelm Vatke (1806-1882) was less influential but even more original than Julius Wellhausen (1844—1918).⁹

David Friedrich Strauss (1808-1874)

im Reiche Gottes," *Der Lutheraner*, XLVI (July 29, 1890), 126. Original in italics. From a lecture presented at the convention of the Missouri Synod in 1890.

⁶ John Dillenberger and Claude Welch, *Protestant Christianity Interpreted through Its Development* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), pp. 182—189.

Kenneth Scott Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age* (Vol. II of *The Nineteenth Century in Europe: The Protestant and Eastern Churches*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), pp. 12—16.

⁷ F. L. Cross, ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957), pp. 394, 395, 1148, 1239, 443; Latourette, II, 41.

⁸ Cross, *Oxford Dict. of the Chr. Ch.*, p. 480; Latourette, II, 42 f.

⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 43.

in his *Leben Jesu*, published in 1835, applied the "myth theory" and raised a commotion that gave a "major impulse" to critical studies of the New Testament.¹⁰ Tuebingen's Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792—1860) did not quell the storm by his Hegelian interpretation of New Testament history."

The recall of these names is enough to point up this movement in Protestantism, the elaboration and acceptance of "higher criticism." Dillenberger and Welch, moreover, make it plain that the movement included an attack on the "significance and authority of the Bible as a whole." They say: "In short, it was all up with the dogma of the inerrancy of scripture."¹²

In this country the newer theories were popularized by men like Lyman Abbott and John Fiske.¹³ In the 1890s Charles A. Briggs became the center of a storm within the Presbyterian Church,¹⁴ a storm which raged until Gresham Machen and his followers withdrew in 1929 to organ-

ize Westminster Theological Seminary.]” Harry Emerson Fosdick was a prime target of the Fundamentalists for such books as his *The Modern Use of the Bible*.” However, more than a decade before, beginning in 1909, the twelve volumes of *The Fundamentalist* were being mailed to Protestant pastors throughout the length and breadth of the country.” In their controversy with the Liberals, the sympathies of the Missouri Synod theologians were on the side of the Fundamentalists, although by no means entirely so.¹⁸

In the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy, they warned, the Fundamentalists would lose, because of their approach to Scripture.

Because they are not willing to take the first step, that is, to believe that the Bible is the *verbally* inspired Word of God, that it must be taken as it reads, and that no man has the right to read into the words of the Bible his own opinions, therefore they are not willing to take the second step, in fact, they cannot consistently do so, namely, deny the others the right which they for themselves have assumed; *nor* can they consistently take the third step,

¹⁰ Ibid., II, 47; Cross, *Oxford Dict. of Chr. Cb.*, p. 1295.

¹¹ Latourette, II, 47-50; Cross, *Oxford Dict. of Chr. Cb.*, pp. 142, 143.

¹² Dillenberger and Welch, p. 195, italics in the original.

¹³ Ira V. Brown, *Lyman Abbott: Christian Evolutionist, A Study in Religious Liberalism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953).

Aug. Schuessler, "Einige Aphorismen über das Verhältniss von Theologie und Wissenschaft," *Lehre und Wehre*, XLIII (June 1897), 176—178, inveighs against both Abbott and Fiske. He calls Abbott "The Goliath of the evolutionists of our country."

¹⁴ For a Missourian reaction to the *Casus Briggs* see F[rancis] P[ieper], "Die Presbyterianer und die Lehre von der Inspiration der Heiligen Schrift," *ibid.*, XXXIX (June 1893), 161—166.

¹⁵ Ned B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955) gives a sympathetic account of Machen's role.

Lefferts A. Loetscher, *The Broadening Church: A Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church since 1869* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954).

¹⁶ Francis P. Weisenburger, *Ordeal of Faith: The Crisis of Church-Going America, 1865 to 1900* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), pp. 80-109.

¹⁷ Clifton E. Olmstead, *History of Religion in the United States* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), pp. 549—553, for "The Conservative Reaction"; also see pp. 467 to 474.

¹⁸ *Infra*, p. 420.

that is separate themselves from those who teach error.¹⁹

Contemporary with the development of "higher criticism," continuing the tradition of Schleiermacher, stood Albrecht Ritschl (1822—1889). His dual emphasis was on justification and reconciliation and on the kingdom of God. He influenced men like Wilhelm Hermann (1846—1922), Adolph von Harnack (1851—1930), and Ernst Troeltsch (1865—1923).²⁰ These in turn influenced some of the makers of the social gospel.

Along with the liberalism of Ritschl and Schleiermacher and the attacks on Scripture by Strauss and Wellhausen and others came the impact of the evolutionary theories popularized by Charles Darwin (1809—1882) in his *The Origin of Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man* (1871). Science and the Christian faith were regarded as incompatible. Nonetheless the scientific movement had a tremendous influence on theology.²¹ H. G. Wood said

¹⁹ J. H. C. Fritz, "Will the Fundamentalists Win Out in Their Fight Against the Modern Liberals?" *Theological Monthly*, IV (Aug. and Sept. 1924), 240; see pp. 234-242 for the entire article.

²⁰ Cross, *Dict. of Chr. Ch.*, p. 1168; Dillenberger and Welch, pp. 198-200; Latourette, II, 16, 17.

²¹ Dillenberger and Welch, pp. 200-206.

Ralph H. Gabriel, *The Coarse of American Democratic Thought: An Intellect & History Since 1815* (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1940), pp. 161-172.

Olmstead, pp. 465—467.

Weisenburg, pp. 61—80.

Barbara M. Cross, Horace *Bushnell: Minister to a Changing America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), pp. 115-133, tells about Bushnell's reaction to Darwinism. His *Nature and Supernatural* (1858) already had grappled with some of the problems of the "new science."

that Darwin undermined Genesis, challenged Theism, weakened the Fatherhood of God, and threw doubt on the hope of personal immortality.²² Dillenberger and Welch pointed out that because of the widespread acceptance of the hypothesis of evolution in fields other than biology "increased emphasis was laid upon the influence of cultural environment in the development of religious thought and practice."²³ Three trends in Protestant thought, which, according to them, "may properly be associated with liberal theology," resulted. The one was a much greater stress "on the 'immanence' of God"; the second, "the reinterpretation of traditional conceptions of sin and redemption"; and the third, that the relationships between Christian and non-Christian religions were softened and greater syncretism (the term is not theirs) resulted.²⁴

For all that, as an eminent American historian pointed out, "The impact of science, and especially of the Darwinian theory, was violent but not shattering." He concluded:

It was a tribute either to the skill of Fiske, Beecher, Lyman Abbott, and their allies, or to the ability of Americans to divorce their Sunday from their weekday world, that the most scientific-minded people in the western world were, on the whole, those whose faith was least impaired by science.

Certainly by every test but that of influ-

The literature on Darwinism and its influence is large. No attempt is made to cite even a significant portion of it.

²² H. G. Wood, *Belief and Unbelief since 1860* (Cambridge: University Press, 1955), pp. 50-56.

²³ Dillenberger and Welch, p. 205.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 205, 206.

ence the church had never been stronger than it was at the opening of the twentieth century, and its strength increased steadily. . . . The typical Protestant of the twentieth century inherited his religion as he did his politics, though rather more casually, and was quite unable to explain the difference between denominations: We found himself a church member by accident and persisted in his affiliation by habit; he greeted each recurring Sunday service with a sense of surprise and was persuaded that he conferred a benefit upon his rector and his community by participating in church services. The church was something to be "supported," like some aged relative whose claim was vague but inescapable.²⁵

In how far evolution contributed to the growing secularism of the nation is difficult to say. Materialism, however, had pervaded the intellectual scene and overshadowed the spiritual. The trend had set in long before 1859, to be sure; by the end of the 19th century it had become most evident.²⁶ "The church itself confessed to a steady secularization: as it invaded the social and economic fields, it retreated from the intellectual."²⁷ And, we might add, all too frequently from the spiritual.

Along with Liberalism, evolutionism, and Biblical criticism the restless and ebullient era known as the Gilded Age or the Era of Big Business confronted the churches with social and economic problems. Nascent socialism and expanding

unionism among the laboring classes, the humanitarianism of philanthropic industrialists, and the impact of frontier forces which engendered spiritual activism seemed, at least, to demand the involvement of the churches. Roman Catholic concerns, made articulate in the *Rerum novarum* of Leo XIII (May 15, 1891),²⁸ may have implemented the movement. An American theology — so it was touted — had taken shape in the social gospel. A descendant of the "patriarch of Lutheranism in America," William A. Muhlenberg (an Episcopal rector) launched the institutional church, which was developed by W. S. Rainsford. The interchurch or undenominational city mission and settlement houses, such as the famed Hull House in Chicago, associated with the name of Jane Addams, promoted the program. Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* (1879) did more than advocate the single tax. It sought an ethically superior society.²⁹ With Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888) it asked for the good life — in a material sense — although Bellamy's novel was utopian in its frame of reference.³⁰ Inveighing against "the present barbarous industrial and social arrangements," Bellamy tried to further nationalism as "the means of social salvation."³¹ Thus various factors, social, economic, intellectual, combined to lend essence and weight to the writing

²⁵ Henry Steele Coinmager, *The American Mind: An Interpretation of American Thought and Character Since the 1880s*; paperbound ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959 [c. 1950]), p. 166.

²⁶ James H. Nichols, *History of Christianity, 1650—1950: Secularization of the West* (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1956), p. 269.

²⁷ Commager, p. 167.

²⁸ Etienne Gilson, ed. *The Church Speaks to the Modern World: The Social Teachings of Leo XIII* (Image Books. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1954), 200—244.

²⁹ Gabriel, pp. 198—204.

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 210—212.

³¹ Joseph Schiffman, *Edward Bellamy: Selected Writings on Religion and Society*. American Heritage Series (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1955), p. 129.

and pronouncement of a Washington Gladden, Richard T. Ely, George D. Herron, Francis G. Peabody, Josiah Strong, Henry King, or Charles M. Sheldon. It remained, however, for Walter Rauschenbusch to articulate the social gospel most clearly in his *Christianity and the Social Crisis* (1907) and *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (1918).³² Progress and prosperity, it was said, would be certain hallmarks of the kingdom of God.³³ Among Lutherans J. H. W. Stuckenberg in his *Christian Sociology* (1880) advocated an application of Christianity to social problems.³⁴

A major pronouncement of the social gospel, however, came from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. In 1908 it adopted the Social Creed of the Churches. It called for the protection of the workingman against the hardship "resulting from the swift crises of industrial change," for the necessity of "con-

ciliation and arbitration" in labor disputes, for the "abolition of child labor," for the "suppression of the 'sweating system,'" for the "reduction of the hours of labor," for "provision for the old age of workers," for "the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery," and for "the most equitable division of the products of industry."³⁵ The platform seemed radical to many; visionary to others. However conservative some churchmen might have been, the social gospel, nevertheless, maintained itself as a force in American religious life into the 1930s.

The concerns of the churches with the social order, pacifism, prohibition, the Depression, and the New Deal were concerns that grew out of the social gospel. That they were overemphasized and weakened the respect which many held for the churches was stated especially by those who found the social gospel and Liberalism going hand in hand.

Billy Sunday denounced the doctrines of universal brotherhood ("the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man") and of social service and, in the words of his biographer, "damned the whole social gospel movement as sacrilegious, un-American quackery."³⁶ Sunday advocated civic reform, prohibition, and "the old-fashioned Gospel."³⁷

Sunday belonged to the Fundamentalists. Their adherents stood for more than opposition to the social gospel. We have al-

³² B. Y. Landis, ed. *A Rauschenbusch Reader* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), is a convenient compilation of the best in Rauschenbusch's writings.

³³ For the social gospel movement see especially Charles H. Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865 to 1915* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940); Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949); Robert Moats Miller, *American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919 to 1939* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina press, 1958); Herbert W. Schneider, *Religion in 20th Century America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952); Paul Carter, *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel. Social and Political Liberalism in American Protestant Churches, 1920-1940* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1956); Nichols, pp. 269-282; Gabriel, pp. 308-330; Commager, pp. 165-177; Olmstead, pp. 475 to 494; Weisenburger, pp. 117-140.

³⁴ A. R. Wentz, *A Basic History of Lutheranism in America* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955), pp. 329, 330.

³⁵ Elias B. Sanford, *Origin and History of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America* (Hartford, Conn.: S. S. Scranton Co., 1916), pp. 493-503, esp. pp. 497 f.

³⁶ William G. McLoughlin, Jr., *Billy Sunday Was His Real Name* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1955), p. 138.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 225-234.

ready noted the fact of the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. The Fundamentalists were essentially polemical, opposing evolutionism, higher criticism, and Liberalism. They upheld the literal interpretation of the Bible, especially of Gen. 1 and 2, the deity of Christ, the substitutionary atonement, **the** second coming of Christ, and, in many instances, a premillennium. Their leaders included men like J. Gresham Machen, John Roach Straton, William Jennings Bryan, William Bell Riley. The controversy (who disturbed Israel, the Modernists or the Fundamentalists?) reached its peak in the 1920s, especially among the Baptists, both Northern and Southern, and the Methodists. Highly publicized, the Scopes trial **was** only one phase of this controversy.³⁸ Fundamentalism, however, remained a significant force in Protestantism.

Of lesser importance but not to be ignored is the movement known as Dispensationalism. Allied to Fundamentalism and literalistic in its approach to the Bible, it emphasized the eschatological portions of Scripture. Cyrus S. Scofield was most influential in spreading such teachings.³⁹

By 1932 the various movements in theology in America were largely in a state of transition. Reinhold Niebuhr's *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (1932) was one indication that a new movement was under way. Walter Lowrie's *Our Concern with*

the Theology of Crisis (in the same year) by its very title was descriptive of the new movement. Karl Barth's *The Word of God and the Word of Man* had appeared in 1928; in 1934 George W. Richards *Beyond Fundamentalism and Modernism* appeared. Neo-orthodoxy, the theology of crisis, or whatever labels may be used, are names of a new era in theology in America begun between 1932 and 1934.⁴⁰

What were the reactions of the Missouri Synod theologians to the various theological movements between 1887 and 1932? Specifically what were their reactions to Biblical criticism, evolutionism, and the social gospel?

Throughout the history of the Missouri Synod there have been voices raised against the denial of the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures. In the preface of the first volume of *Der Lutheraner* issued after the organization of Synod, now published as an official organ of the church body, Walther wrote:

... die Bibel Alten und Neuen Testaments ist Gottes unwandelbares ewiges Wort, vom ersten Buch Mosis an bis zur Offenbarung St. Johannis vom Heiligen Geiste eingegeben Wort für Wort. Diese heiligen Schriften der Apostel und Propheten sind daher die einzige Regel und Richtschnur alles Glaubens, die einzige Quelle aller seligmachenden Erkenntnis und die einzige Richterin aller, die christ-

³⁸ Norman F. Futniss, *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918—1931*, Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany: 59 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954). Stewart G. Cole, *The History of Fundamentalism* (New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931).

³⁹ C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America: Its Rise and Development* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1958), p. 111 et passim.

⁴⁰ Sidney E. Ahlstrom, "Continental Influence on American Christian Thought Since World War I," *Church History*, XXVII (Sept. 1958), 256—272, esp. pp. 264—267; Olmstead, pp. 574—578.

Published just as this article was going to press is the two-volume *Critical Bibliography of Religion in America*, by Nelson R. Burr in *Religion in American Life*, ed. James W. Smith and A. Leland Jamison (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1961).

liche Lehre betreffenden Streitigkeiten. Diese geschriebene Offenbarung des allerhöchsten Gottes soll daher weder nach der blinden Vernunft, noch nach dem verkehrten menschlichen Herzen ausgelegt werden, sie erklärt sich selbst; es soll weder etwas davon noch dazu gethan und von keinem Buchstaben derselben, weder zur Rechten noch zur Linken, abgewichen, sondern alles so in kindlich demüthigem, einfältigem Glauben angenommen werden, wie die Worte lauten.⁴¹

This statement summarizes the position of the Missouri Synod for a hundred years. Walther's "Vier Thesen über das Schriftprincip" (1867) upheld these same principles.⁴² In 1874 Walther bewailed the fact that the revival of Lutheranism in Germany saw 3 defense of Christianity and a denial of fundamental doctrines, among them *die {Lehre} von der göttlichen Eingebung und Irrthumslosigkeit der kanonischen Schriften des Alten und Neuen Bundes*.⁴³ It is possible that Walther stimulated the writing of an essay in 1886 against the findings of the new theologians regarding the Bible.⁴⁴ Be that as it may,

⁴¹ [C. F. W. Walther], "Vorwort des Redacteurs zum vierten Jahrgang des *Lutheraner*," *Der Lutheraner*, IV (Sept. 8, 1847), 1.

⁴² *Lehre und Wehre*, X I I I (April 1867), 97—111.

⁴³ [C. F. W. Walther], "Synodalrede," *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1874, p. 9.

⁴⁴ G. St[oeckhardt], "Was sagt die Schrift von sich selbst? (Mit Berücksichtigung der gerade auch neuerdings erhobenen Einwürfe der neueren Theologie)," *Lehre und Wehre*, XXXII (June 1886), 161—168; *ibid.*, XXXII (July and Aug. 1886), 205—215; *ibid.*, XXXII (Sept. 1886), 238—257; *ibid.*, XXXII (Oct. 1886), 281—288; *ibid.*, XXXII (Nov. 1886), 313—323; *ibid.*, XXXII (Dec. 1886), 345 to 355. The essay was presented at the pastoral conference of Missouri.

According to F. P[ieper], "Dr. C. F. W. Walther als Theologe," *ibid.*, XXXIV (July and

Missouri Synod theologians knew the theological developments in Germany at first hand. In 1887, while Walther was slowly nearing his end, the editor of *Der Lutheraner* reiterated: "Die iutherische Kirche richtet sich in allem, was sie lehrt, genau nach der heiligen Schrift, sie thut nichts dazu, sie thut nichts davon, sie unterwirft sich unbedingt dem Worte Gottes."⁴⁵ The infallibility and clarity of Holy Writ was emphasized repeatedly.⁴⁶

In 1892 *Der Lutheraner* carried a series of articles by Prof. Stoeckhardt on "Die Bibel das unfehlbare Gotteswort."⁴⁷ Current theories of Biblical criticism, the misgivings of scientists, and modern claims of errors in the Scriptures were examined in popular language. The emphasis was that everything in the Scriptures is God's Word and everything is true, certain, reliable. Again, Guenrher wrote: "Die heilige Schrift ist ja von Gott eingegeben, 2 Tim.

Aug. 1888), 193, Walther was *not* the author of the article, "Was lehren die neueren orthodox sein wollenden Theologen von der Inspiration?" *ibid.*, XVII (Feb. 1871), 33-45; *ibid.*, XVII (March 1871), 65-76; *ibid.*, XVII (April 1871), 97—106; *ibid.*, XVII (May 1871), 129 to 141.

⁴⁵ [Martin] G[uenther], "Vorwort," *Der Lutheraner*, XLIII (Jan. 1, 1887), 1.

⁴⁶ E. g., F[rancis] P[ieper], "Vorwort," *Lehre und Wehre*, XXXIII (Jan. 1887), 1-7.

F[rancis] P[ieper], "Vorwort," *ibid.*, XXXVIII (Jan. 1892), 1-7; *ibid.*, XXXVIII (Feb. 1892), 33—40.

G. G., "Die Angriffe der modernen Theologen auf Gottes Wort," a series appearing in Vol. XLII of *ibid.*, concluded in XLIII (Jan. 1897), with an article captioned "Die moderne Theologie hat kein Gottes Wort mehr."

⁴⁷ G. St[oeckhardt], "Die Bibel das unfehlbare Gotteswort," *Der Lutheraner*, XLVIII (Aug. 16, 1892), 133, 134; XLVIII (Aug. 30, 1892), 141—143; XLVIII (Sept. 13, 1892), 149—151; XLVIII (Sept. 27, 1892), 157 to 159; XLVIII (Oct. 11, 1892), 166, 167.

3,16, sie ist das Wort des groszen majestätschen, **allein** weisen Gottes, sie ist die Wahrheit, Joh. 17, 11, und darum unfehlbar, sie ist das Wort, das alles richtet und von niemand gerichtet werden darf; das Wort, unter welches alle Welt sich beugen muss." 48

W. Willkomm read an essay to the convention of the Ev. Luth. Free Church in Saxony in 1911, "Ueber die wörtliche Eingebung der ganten Heiligen Schrift mit besondrer Berücksichtigung der modernen Einwände." 49 To sacrifice the verbal inspiration and complete inerrancy of the Scriptures meant, wrote Bente, to open the floodgates of rationalism, to abandon sound principles of exegesis, and to endanger such doctrines as the deity of Christ. The Lutheran Symbols become meaningless. "Alle diese Lehren, auch die fundamentalsten, geraten darum ins Schwanken von dem Augenblick an, da die wörtliche Inspiration und völlige Irrtumslosigkeit der Schrift in Frage gezogen wird." 50 Verbal inspiration was denied within the General Synod and the General Council, it was said. "Auch die Lehre von der Inspiration betreffend ist in der americanisch-lutherischen Kirche erst noch Einigkeit hertustellen." 51 To grant infallibility and inerrancy in *theologics* but

not in *non-theologics* was not enough for sound Lutheranism.⁵²

The Missouri Synod, like *Lehre und Wehre*, was not *charakterlos*. Anchored in the theology of the 16th century, fortified with fidelity to the Lutheran Confessions, *Lehre und Wehre* maintained the inerrancy of the Scriptures and their verbal inspiration.⁵³ Against Wofman, Frank, Luthardt, and others it insisted that the Scriptures are the only source of doctrine. It upheld the *Schriftprinzip*. Thereby it was safeguarded, too, it was said, from indifference and unionism, secure in its reliance **on** Scripture alone.⁵⁴ Verbal inspiration was accepted a *posteriori* as well as a *priori*. The entire Scriptures are verbally inspired; therefore also the *Realien* were given by divine inspiration: history, geography,

⁵² Ibid., p. 87. "Astronomie, Geologie, Physik, Chronologie, etc." are mentioned specifically.

⁵³ F[riedrich] B[ente], "Vorwort," *ibid.*, L (Jan. 1904), 6: "Sie bekennt sich zur Verbalinspiration und Unfehlbarkeit der ganzen heiligen Schrift. Sie bekennt sich zur Bibel, nicht bloss sofern sie Gottes Wort ist und Wahrheiten enthält, sondern weil sie in allen Worten und Lehren Gottes Wort ist und darum nur Wahrheiten birgt und gar keine Irrthümer und Widersprüche. Und das auch nicht bloss in den streng theologischen Materien, sondern auch in ihren zahlreichen historischen, chronologischen, geologischen, biologischen und astronomischen Angaben." This is the first instance found by the present writer of this enumeration in Missouri Synod literature and may be regarded as the forerunner of paragraph one of the 1932 *Brief Statement*.

In a review of R. Fr. Noesgen's *Die lutherische Lehre von der Inspiration* (Guetersloh: Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1909) F[riedrich] B[ente] criticized him for not upholding the historical, geological, and similar pronouncements of the Bible. *Lehre und Wehre*, LV (Dec. 1909), 550, 551.

⁵⁴ F. B[ente], "Votwort," *ibid.*, L (Jan. 1904), 1-20.

⁴⁸ [Martin] G[uenther], "Vorwort," *ibid.*, XLVI (Jan. 1, 1890), 1.

⁴⁹ See the notice in *Lehre und Wehre*, LVII (Dec. 1911), 545, regarding the *Verhandlungen* of this church body.

⁵⁰ F. B[ente], "Vorwort," *ibid.*, LX (Jan. 1914), 1-11; the quotation is from p. 7.

⁵¹ F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, L (Jan. 1904), 39 f., with quotations from the *Lutheran World*, *Lutheran Church Review*, and the introduction of Haas' *Biblical Criticism*.

Lehre und Wehre, L (Feb. 1904), 85-87, with citations from the *Lutheran Church Review*.

geology, astronomy, psychology, pedagogy, biology, etc.⁵⁵ The Bible is God's Word, not merely *abgeleitetes Wort Gottes*, as a speaker stated at the Conference in Oslo (1925). Only when the Lutheran Church remains firm in its conviction that the Bible is the Word of God will she be true to her own character and sure of her strength.⁵⁶ When voices were raised in the United Lutheran Church of America which maintained the verbal inspiration, inerrancy, and authority of the Scriptures, they were hailed with joy.⁵⁷ However, that leading theologians within the United Lutheran Church spoke of discrepancies in the Scriptures and denied verbal inspiration in favor of grades of inspiration caused no little concern within the Missouri Synod.⁵⁸

In 1925 the *Theological Monthly* published an article which contended that "the Bible teaches that it is in all its parts the Word of God and in no parts the word of man."⁵⁹ The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are "an infallible record" of God's revelation to man.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ P. E. Kretzmann, "Die Inspiration der Realien," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, I (Jan. 1930), 21—32.

⁵⁶ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Ist die Heilige Schrift direktes oder nur 'abgeleitetes Wort Gottes'?" *Lehre und Wehre*, LXXII (July 1926), 193—200.

⁵⁷ [Th.] E[ngelder], "Die Inspiration, Irrtumslosigkeit und Autorität der Schrift," *ibid.*, LXXV (April 1929), 97—100.

⁵⁸ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Vorwort," *ibid.*, LXXI (Jan. 1925), 6.

⁵⁹ Peter C. Krey, "Every Word Is Truth, a Defense of Verbal Inspiration," *Theological Monthly*, V (March 1925), 68—74; the quotation is from p. 71 and is italicized in the original.

⁶⁰ Clarence E. Macartney, "The Authority of the Holy Scriptures," *Theological Monthly*, V

At the dedication of Concordia Seminary (1926) J. W. Behnken, at that time President of the Texas District, disclaimed the theological aberrations of the age and pleaded for a retention of the Scriptures and the doctrine of *sola gratia*:

One of the cancerous diseases which have developed in many theological institutions today is this, that some professors have joined the ranks of Modernists, evolutionists, higher critics, etc. By the grace of God this shall never happen at our new Concordia Seminary. May God ever keep our seminary firm and decided in its stand for the truths of the Bible, especially the cardinal truth of salvation by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith, that it may ever be a training camp to send forth battalion after battalion of stalwart warriors who in the face of modern Bible-undermining, Christ-denying, faith-destroying attacks will valiantly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints and with the sword of the Spirit gain one victor after another 'for the Lord Jesus Christ to the glory of God and the salvation of many immortal souls.'⁶¹

The question of Bible criticism was faced not only in quasi-learned articles, popular presentations, and sermons. Investigations of the findings of the critics were made in scholarly presentations. L. Fuerbringer examined the various theories con-

(Oct. 1925), 294—300, esp. p. 295. This is "an address delivered at the Quadrennial World Convention of the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System, Cardiff, Wales, June 29, 1925" (p. 294). It was reprinted from the *Princeton Theological Review* (July 1925) "as evidence that others think about the authority of the Holy Scriptures as Lutherans do" (p. 300).

⁶¹ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Mitteilungen aus den Reden, die bei der Einweihung unserer Sankt Louiser theologischen Anstalt gehalten wurden," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXXII (Sept. 1926), 273.

nected with the origin of the books of Moses.⁶² F. C. Pasche concerned himself with questions of the transmission of the Scriptures and of the infallibility of the Scriptures.⁶³ Walter A. Maier joined the St. Louis seminary faculty in 1922. With a firsthand acquaintance with the writings of the higher critics and a thorough knowledge of Semitics, he examined the critical interpretation of the Psalms and found it wanting.⁶⁴ He reached the same conclusion with respect to Is. 1: 18.⁶⁵

The extreme emphasis during the second half of the 19th century and the first three decades of the 20th century on the form of Scripture by the polemicists of the Missouri Synod is understandable in the light of the developments in contemporary theology. This emphasis is reflected in *A Brief Statement*. It did not mean, how-

ever, that the men of this age knew nothing of the *function* of Scripture or that they minimized the saving power of the inspired Word of God. To them it was a living Word.⁶⁶ Now, however, the situation called for a defense of its verbal and plenary inspiration; they would not fail in defending the ramparts they felt called on to protect. Theology to them has three characteristics: it teaches only the Word of God; it teaches that the forgiveness of sins or justification is received only by grace, for Christ's sake, without the deeds of the Law, alone through faith; it makes the believer certain of the grace of God.⁶⁷ The Modernists or Liberals were scored for their refusal to accept the Scriptures⁶⁸ and for their rejection of the atoning sacrifice of Christ on the cross.⁶⁹

Confessional Lutheranism, they believed, required them to defend the verbal and plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. The Lutheran Confessions upheld the doctrine of inspiration, although not *ex professo*. In common with the Reformers of the 16th century they regarded the Bible as the Word of God.⁷⁰ Luther identified the Bible with the Word of God and taught no other

⁶² L[udwig] F[uerbringer], "Die neuere Pentateuchkritik," *ibid.*, XLIX (Feb. 1903), 33-37; *ibid.*, XLIX (April 1903), 97-104; *ibid.*, XLIX (May 1903), 133-141; *ibid.*, XLIX (June 1903), 161-168; *ibid.*, XLIX (July and August 1903), 214-227; *ibid.*, XLIX (December 1903), 359-364; *ibid.*, L (Feb. 1904), 69-75; *ibid.*, L (March 1904), 110-121; *ibid.*, L (April 1904), 155-164; *ibid.*, L (May 1904), 208-214; *ibid.*, L (June 1904), 259-266; *ibid.*, L (July and Aug. 1904), 309-321; *ibid.*, L (Sept. 1904), 410 to 419; *ibid.*, L (Nov. 1904), 507-513.

⁶³ F. C. Pasche, "Finden sich in der Schrift Schreibfehler?" *Ibid.*, LXVII (May 1921), 140-154; F. C. Pasche, "Die Schrift redet immer wahr," *ibid.*, LXVII (June 1921), 172 to 180; *ibid.*, LXVII (July 1921), 200-208.

⁶⁴ Walter A. Maier, "The Pre-Israelite Psalms-the Historical Basis for a Readjustment of the Higher Critical Theories Concerning the Psalter," *ibid.*, LXXI (June 1925), 229-237.

⁶⁵ Walter A. Maier, "Vagaries of Tendential Exegesis as Illustrated by the Interpretation of Is. 1:18," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, III (March 1932), 175-180.

⁶⁶ See, e.g., "Die Lehre von den Gnadenmitteln," *Der Lutheraner*, XLIII (Sept. 1, 1887), 133-134.

⁶⁷ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Drei Merkmale der rechten Theologie," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXXV (Oct. 1929), 289-293.

⁶⁸ J. T. Mueller, "Lehrfortbildung und Lehrzerstörung," *ibid.*, LXXI (June 1925), 191 to 201.

⁶⁹ W. H. T. Dau, "The Meaning of Calvary in the Minds of the Modernists," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, III (Feb. 1932), 85-95.

⁷⁰ [P. E.] K[retzmann], "Unsere Bekenntnisse und die Lehre von der Inspiration," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXXI (Oct. 1925), 351-354.

doctrine of inspiration than verbal inspiration, they maintained.⁷¹

The attacks on evolutionism and the social gospel stemmed from their fidelity to the Lutheran Confessions and the Scriptures. As early as 1801 an essay appeared by a writer of the Missouri Synod against the theories of Charles Darwin as advocated in his *Origin of Species* (1859).⁷² In 1900 *Lehre und Wehre* again carried an essay on evolution.⁷³ Nine years later another series had the caption "Evolution and the Bible."⁷⁴ Th. Engelder in a lengthy essay in *Lehre und Wehre* in 1912 warned against *die trunkene Wissenschaft*. Modern theology and modern science belonged to this category, according to him.⁷⁵ They want to rob the Christian of his faith, his

⁷¹ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Vorwort," *ibid.*, LXXIV (Jan. 1928), 7-9. F. Pfotenhauer, "Synodalrede," *ibid.*, LXXV (July 1929), 193 to 195, too, maintained the dependence of the reformers on the Scriptures for the formulations of the Lutheran Confessions.

⁷² [C. I. R.] L[ange], "Die biblische Schöpfungsgeschichte und die geologischen Erdbildungstheorien," *ibid.*, VII (Feb. 1861), 39-43; *ibid.*, VII (March 1861), 68-74; *ibid.*, VII (April 1861), 98-102.

⁷³ F[riedrich] B[ente], "Evolution," *ibid.*, XLVI (Jan. 1900), 8-15; *ibid.*, XLVI (Feb. 1900), 38-47; XLVI (May 1900), 135-141; *ibid.*, XLVI (June 1900), 164-170; XLVI (July and Aug. 1900), 217-239.

⁷⁴ J. Hoeness, "Die Evolution und die Bibel," *ibid.*, LV (July 1909), 289-299; *ibid.*, LV (Aug. 1909), 351-359; *ibid.*, LV (Oct. 1909), 454-464; *ibid.*, LV (Nov. 1909), 499 to 510; *ibid.*, LV (Dec. 1909), 546-550.

⁷⁵ Th. Engelder, "Die trunkene Wissenschaft; was sie will, und warum wir wenig Respekt vor ihr haben," *ibid.*, LVIII (Dec. 1912), 541-553; *ibid.*, LIX (Jan. 1913), 17 to 27; *ibid.*, LIX (Feb. 1913), 70-77; *ibid.*, LIX (May 1913), 215-222; *ibid.*, LIX (June 1913), 256-267; *ibid.*, LIX (July 1913), 306 to 312; *ibid.*, LIX (Aug. 1913), 358-362; *ibid.*, LIX (Sept. 1913), 403-412.

Bible, his Savior.⁷⁶ The doctrines of man's innate depravity and the redemption we denied by the evolutionists, who also rejected, of course, the Genesis account of creation." They denied the Scriptures. The writer maintained his belief in the divinity and the integrity of the Sacred Record. "Wir nehmen jedes Wort der Schrift an, wenn auch alle Welt sich dagegen auflehnte."⁷⁸ The scientists themselves admit that they are advancing hypotheses.⁷⁹ These are of ten illogical.⁸⁰

The heaviest attacks against evolution by a Missouri Synod theologian were made by Theodore Graebner. His *Evolution*⁸¹ and *Essays on Evolution*⁸² ran into several editions. It remained, however, for his massive *God and the Cosmos*⁸³ to bring the most reasoned and documented attacks against this theory. Surveying the modern scene—the work was a distillation and compilation of notes made during three decades or more—it was an apologetic against various modern forces. Although the work did not appear until 1943 it may be regarded as a product of the Middle Period of Missouri's history. Missouri's attitude on evolution during that time can perhaps be best summarized in the words

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, LVIII (Dec. 1912), 543.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 549 f.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, LIX (Jan. 1913), 17 ff. The quotation is from p. 22 and is in italics in the original.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, LIX (Feb. 1913), 70 ff.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, LIX (May 1913), 215 ff.

⁸¹ Theodore Graebner, *Evolution* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1922).

⁸² Theodore Graebner, *Essays on Evolution* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1925).

⁸³ Theodore Graebner, *God and the Cosmos: A Critical Analysis of Atheism, Materialism, and Evolution* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1943).

of one of Graebner's colleagues in the journal which Graebner edited:

"Christian evolution" is neither Christian, agreeing with the teachings of the divine Word, nor is it an evolution; it is simply a myth.⁸⁴

In the face of the cries that the church should accept the findings of science the Bible was held up as the only source of truth; besides that, the speculations of science changed from time to time.⁸⁵ "God's Spirit has spoken to us through the Bible, speaks to us through Christian preaching, and creates that response in our hearts which we call faith," it was pointed out, a faith that will cling to the pronouncements of the Word of God.⁸⁶

Because of their stance toward the Holy Scriptures, the denial of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and the abandonment of the essentials of the Christian faith, Modernism and Liberalism brought forth the severest kind of condemnation by Missouri Synod writers. Such basic doctrines as original sin, the deity of Christ, the substitutionary atonement by Christ were declared to be in jeopardy unless the inerrancy of the Scriptures were maintained.⁸⁷ It was said, e.g., that the doctrine

of the Virgin Birth is in danger of being set aside if the Lucan account is regarded as an interpolation.⁸⁸ Perhaps the resolutions of the Walther League in 1923 will serve to summarize the stand of the Missouri Synod:

We believe that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, whose inerrancy not only in matters of doctrine, but also in every other statement, no matter to which field of knowledge it refers, is unquestioned. . . . We believe the Book of Genesis and the first page of the Bible to be God's own record of the creation of the world, holding this position as a point of faith. . . . We represent sound Lutheran fundamentalism in upholding not only a few of the basic principles and doctrines of the Bible, but all of them, from Genesis to Revelation, no matter whether in so-called conformity with our reason or not.⁸⁹

The rise of the social Gospel was not noticed immediately. One of the first notices of the social gospel by the Missouri Synod came in a brief reference to a state-

Wehre, LXXIII (Aug. 1927), 225—234; *ibid.*, LXXIII (Sept. 1927), 264—268. See also F[rancis] P[ieper], "Vorwort," *ibid.*, LXXII (Jan. 1926), 1—8.

Pieper (1852—1931) found in Adolf von Harnack (1851—1930) the German theologian whose views he most persistently attacked. See, e.g.: F[rancis] P[ieper], "Das Wesen des Christenthums nach Professor Harnack," *ibid.*, XLVII (Nov. 1901), 321—327; *ibid.*, XLVII (Dec. 1901), 353—359; F[rancis] P[ieper], "Vorwort," *ibid.*, XLVIII (Jan. 1902), 1—7; *ibid.*, XLVIII (Feb. 1902), 53—58; *ibid.*, XLVIII (March 1902), 65—69.

⁸⁸ [Th.] E[ngelder], "The Troubles of the Interpolationists," *Theological Monthly*, IX (May 1929), 136—142; *ibid.*, IX (June 1929), 165—170; *ibid.*, IX (July 1929), 204 to 210.

⁸⁹ F[riedrich] B[iente], a review of "Resolutions Adopted at the Thirty-First International Convention of the Walther League," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXIX (Oct. and Nov. 1923), 322.

⁸⁴ [Wm.] A[rndt], "Can Evolution and Christianity Be Harmonized?" *The Lutheran Witness*, XLII (June 5, 1923), 186.

⁸⁵ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Zur Evolution als feststehender Tatsache," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXXI (Sept. 1925), 324—328.

⁸⁶ "Evolution und die Bibel," *ibid.*, LSXI (Dec. 1925), 427—430.

Th. Engelder, "The Shifting Sands of Science," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, III (July 1932), 481—489.

⁸⁷ Theodore Graebner, "Is the New Science Hostile to Religion?" *ibid.*, III (Dec. 1932), 917-921.

⁸⁸ J. I.-I. C. Fritz, "Der moderne Unglaube inmitten der äusseren Christenheit," *Lehre und*

ment in the *Lutheran Observer* in 1910 regarding the social tasks of the church, as formulated by Rauschenbusch.⁹⁰ Soon, however, the new chiliasm of the social gospel found its opponents in the Missouri Synod. They called it unscriptural, the product of evolution, new theology, socialism, and fraternalism (lodgery). They deplored its emphasis on social service, unionism, politics, the emancipation of women, social reforms, and so on.⁹¹ Social service ("to save the crops of his parishioners as well as their souls") is the product of the false concepts of the kingdom of God, it was said.⁹² Hence the social gospel was designated as *die moderne Diesseitstheologie*. Walter Rauschenbusch, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Henry Churchill King, Gerald B. Smith, R. Hunter, R. W. Sellars were identified among the leaders of the movement and largely condemned.⁹³

The power of the Gospel was magnified: Not the social gospel but the Gospel of the cross, Pieper taught in an eloquent essay, is the power of God. This Gospel gives the certainty of the grace of God and of salvation. It effects sanctification and good works and especially Christian prayer. It brings false doctrines to naught; it supplies the ability to endure the trials and tribulations, the cross, that comes to the followers of the Christ. It rescues the believers from the terrors of death. It engenders a joyful

anticipation of the Last Day. Because the Gospel brings these blessings, he prayed that it might be maintained without falsifications of any kind!⁹⁴

The Gospel and the sacraments were de-fer&d as the means of grace against the teachings of the Modernists. "May God in His mercy preserve us from the destructive powers of Modernism, especially in its denial of the means of grace!"⁹⁵ The means of grace are the bearers of the grace of God, it was emphasized; "they offer, they convey, they seal, to the believer the benefit of Christ's vicarious atonement."⁹⁶ The Modernists erred in the doctrine of the means of grace and concerning the outward form of the means of grace. In denying the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible they reduce the teaching that the Gospel is a means of grace to an absurdity, it was said, and eliminate the sacraments as gifts of God for the forgiveness of sins.⁹⁷

Faith in the forgiveness of sins which Christ, the incarnate Son of God, obtained for all men by His substitutionary atonement (*satisfactio vicaria*) and which is proclaimed by His Word in the church, this is fundamental in the Christian faith, Pieper maintained, as he examined the Unitarians, the Romanists, the Calvinists, the Arminians, the synergistic Lutherans (so he called them), the deniers of the

⁹⁰ F[riedrich] B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LVI (April 1910), 186 to 187.

⁹¹ [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LXI (Nov. 1915), 521.

⁹² [Th.] G[raebner], "Paragrapheen über den neuesten Chiliasmus," *ibid.*, LXI (Aug. 1915), 337—350.

⁹³ P. E. K[retzmann], "Die moderne Diesseitigkeitstheologie," *ibid.*, LXVI (June 1920), 270—277.

⁹⁴ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Die Kraft des Evangeliums," *ibid.*, LXXIII (Nov. 1927), 321 to 334; *ibid.*, LXXIII (Dec. 1927), 363-369; *ibid.*, LXXIV (Feb. 1928), 40—53; LXXIV (March 1928), 69—83.

⁹⁵ P. E. Kretzmann, "The Means of Grace with Special Reference to Modernism," *Theological Monthly*, IX (Nov. 1929), 335.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 32 l.

⁹⁷ For the entire essay see *ibid.*, IX (Oct. 1929), 289—303; *ibid.*, IX (Nov. 1929), 321 to 335; *ibid.*, IX (Dec. 1929), 362-368.

God-ordained means of grace, and the detractors of the inspiration of Holy Writ, and found them wanting in a clear testimony. Those who denied the inerrancy of the Scriptures also as a rule, he maintained, denied the *satisfactio Christi vicaria*.⁹⁸

⁹⁸ F[rancis] P[ieper], "Das Fundament des christlichen Glaubens," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXXI (Aug. 1925), 286; see p. 288: "Alle Leugner der Inspiration der Heiligen Schrift, das heisst, alle welche die Schriften der Apostel und Propheten nicht Gottes eigenes unfehlbares Wort sein lassen, stossen damit das Fundament des christlichen Glaubens um. Das ist so gewiss, so gewiss Christus bezeugt, dass alle Christen bis ans Ende der Welt durch der Apostel Wort, das wir in ihren Schriften haben, an ihn glauben werden, und Christi Apostel lehrt, dass die ganze christliche Kirche bis an den jüngsten Tag in *allen* und in jedem einzelnen ihrer Glieder auf den Grund der Apostel und Propheten erbaut

This was their glory, a glorying in the Cross of Christ, the glory of the Missourians of the Middle Period. For the sake of the Gospel they combatted the forces and the theological trends of their age. *Sola Scriptura, sola gratia, sola fide* were their watchwords.

St. Louis

(To be continued)

ist. Wenn in einem Leugner der unfehlbaren göttlichen Autorität der Schrift noch der Glaube an Joh. 3, 16 und 1 Joh. 1, 7 sich findet, so ist das eine Inkonssequenz, die jederzeit in verderbliche Konsequenz umschlagen kann." For the entire article see *ibid.*, LXXI (Feb. 1925), 33 to 57; *ibid.*, LXXI (March 1925), 75—82; *ibid.*, LXXI (April 1925), 97—107; *ibid.*, LXXI (May 1925), 129—134; *ibid.*, LXXI (July 1925), 249—263; *ibid.*, LXXI (Aug. 1925), 282—288.

The Historical Background of "A Brief Statement"

(Continued)

By CARL S. MEYER

III

MOVEMENTS WITHIN LUTHERANISM IN AMERICA, 1887-1932

Important as are the major theological movements in America and Germany between 1887 and 1932 for an understanding of the Middle Period of the history of the Missouri Synod, even more important are the movements within Lutheranism in America during this time. These movements, to state the self-evident, have their roots in previous periods. Without an understanding of these movements, however, the doctrinal formulations of the Missouri Synod, especially of *A Brief Statement*, cannot be understood adequately.

When the Missouri Synod was organized in 1847 Lutheranism in America was in, what Jacobs calls, the period of revival and expansion (1817—60).¹ Early in that period the General Synod had been organized (1820) by the Pennsylvania Ministerium, the New York Ministerium, the North Carolina Synod, and the Maryland and Virginia Synod.² The import-

ance of this organization has been stated by Wentz from his point of view as follows:

It provided the means and agencies for prosecuting independent Lutheran educational, missionary, and charitable operations. Above all, it gave to the church of this country, even to those who did not at once become members of the General Synod, a nationwide outlook and interest and a sense of permanent citizenship in this Republic:.'

The withdrawal of the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1823 from the General Synod *could* have permanently disrupted this body. The efforts of Samuel S. Schmucker, however, kept the remnants of the General Synod together and rallied them around the founding of a theological seminary at Gettysburg (1826).⁴ The General Synod had resolved:

In this seminary shall be taught, in the German and English languages, the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures as contained in the Augsburg Confession.

It required that every instructor on the

¹ Henry E. Jacobs, *A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States*, Vol. IV: *The American Church History Series*, ed. Philip Schaff et alii; 5th ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), p. 349.

² J. W. Early, "The Ministerium of Pennsylvania and the Organization of the General Synod," *The Lutheran Church Review*, XI (January 1892), 61—70; *ibid.*, XI (April 1892),

172—186; Jacobs, pp. 351—361; Fr. Bente, *American Lutheranism* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1919), II, 12-175; Abdel R. Wentz, *A Basic History of Lutheranism in America* (Philadelphia: The Muhlenburg Press, 1955), pp. 78—84.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁴ Abdel R. Wentz, *History of the Gettysburg Theological Seminary* (Philadelphia: The Muhlenburg Press, 1926).

teaching staff of the seminary subscribe to the statement:

I believe the Augsburg Confession and the catechism of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God.⁵

The changes made in the Augsburg Confession by Schmucker, therefore, in the "Definite Synodical Platform" of 1855 must be regarded as deviations from the adopted stand of the church body. Schmucker maintained that the Augsburg Confession approved the ceremonies connected with the Roman Mass, condoned private confession and absolution, and taught incorrectly on the Lord's Day, baptismal regeneration, and the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper." As early as 1834 Schmucker indicated his views regarding the Lord's Supper:

After a protracted and unprofitable struggle, the Lutheran church has long since settled down in the happy conviction, that on this, as on all other subjects not clearly determined by the inspired volume, her sons shall be left to follow the dictates of

their own conscience, having none to molest them or make them afraid. In the Lutheran church in this country, each of the above views has some advocates, though the great body of our divines, if we mistake not, embrace either the second or the third.⁷

The Definite Platform was an attempt to make Lutheranism more conformable to the American ecclesiastical scene, Puritan in its outlook and Calvinistic in its theological orientation. However, only three small Lutheran synods accepted it—the Olive Branch Synod, the Wittenberg Synod, and the East Ohio Synod. The organization of the Melancthon Synod by followers of Schmucker in 1857 caused further misgivings within the General Synod, into which it had been admitted, up to the time of its reunion with the Maryland Synod (1869).⁸ The young

⁷ Schmucker, *Popular Theology*, p. 305. The "second view" referred to is: "That the bread and wine remain in all respects unchanged; that the glorified human nature of Christ is not substantially (essentially) present at all, but only influentially, efficaciously and virtually; that is, by a special supernatural influence exerted on all communicants at the time when they receive the bread and wine" (p. 300, in italics in the original). The "third view" is: "The third opinion is, that there is no presence of the glorified HUMAN nature of the Saviour, either substantial or influential, nor any thing mysterious or supernatural in the eucharist; yet that whilst the bread and wine are merely symbolic representations of the Saviour's absent body by which we are reminded of his sufferings, there is also a PECULIAR and SPECIAL spiritual blessing bestowed by the divine Saviour on all worthy communicants, by which their faith and Christian graces are confirmed." (P. 303; italics in the original)

⁸ The best account of this episode in American Lutheranism is still Vergilius Ferm, *The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology: A Study of the Issue Between American Lutheranism and Old Lutheranism* (New York and London: The Century Co., 1927). H. Hoyer, "Die sogenannte

⁵ Quoted by Jacobs, p. 367 from *Catalogue and Constitution for 1840*, p. 10. The Constitution of the General Synod had no confessional paragraph. See the English translation by Dr. Endress in S. S. Schmucker, *Elements of Popular Theology*, 5th ed. (Philadelphia: S. S. Miles, 1845), pp. 451—457. The "Formula for the Government and Discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church." Appendix I. *ibid.*, pp. 420 to 450, likewise had no doctrinal paragraph beyond that which affirmed a belief in the revelation "contained in the books known in Protestant Christendom as the Old and New Testaments." (P. 240)

⁶ *Definite Platform: Doctrinal and Disciplinary, for Evangelical Lutheran District Synods: Constructed in Accordance with the Principles of the General Synod*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Miller & Burlock, 1856). See also "Amerikanisch-lutherische Kirche." *Lehre und Wehre*, I (October 1855), 3, 19, 320.

Missouri Synod followed the events in the General Synod with interest, but found the *Definite Platform* very inadequate? This document, nevertheless, had one very perceptible influence on the Missouri Synod: it was the immediate occasion for Walther's invitation for free conferences of all Lutherans subscribing to the Augsburg Confession.¹⁰

These free conferences, held in Columbus (1856), Pittsburgh (1857), Cleveland (1858), and Fort Wayne (1859), discussed the Augsburg Confession. The fifth conference was not held, partly because of Walther's absence (he was in Europe for reasons of health). Representatives of the Ohio Synod found it undesirable to participate further.

Thus a great attempt to unite Lutherans in America came to an end. That the Conferences produced results, however, cannot be doubted. The formation of the Synodical Conference of 1872 may safely be listed among the fruits of these endeavors.¹¹

Indirectly, these free conferences were a factor also in the formation of the

Amerikanische Bearbeitung der Augsburger Confession," *Lehre und Wehre*, I (November 1855), 336-341.

⁹ Ibid., I (December 1855), 381f.; *ibid.*, II (January 1856), 28; *ibid.*, II (March 1856), 95, 96; *ibid.*, II (July 1856), 223, 224; *ibid.*, II (October 1856), 320; these are all news notes. See H. Hoyer's review of W. J. Mann's *A Plea for the Augsburg Confession in Answer to Objections of the Definite Platform* in *Lehre und Wehre*, II (March 1856), 75-83; "The Broken Platform," *ibid.*, II (March 1856), 92 to 94; *Definite Platform*, *ibid.*, III (January 1857), 27, 28.

¹⁰ [C. F. W. Walther], "Vorwort zu Jahrgang 1856," *ibid.*, II (January 1857), 1-5.

¹¹ E. L. Lueker, "Walther and the Free Lutheran Conferences of 1856-1859," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XV (August 1944), 529-563.

General Council. They had helped to strengthen Lutheran confessionalism and in that way served to bring together some of the synods that met in Fort Wayne in 1867 to organize the General Council. These synods were: The Pennsylvania Ministerium, the New York Ministerium, the Pittsburgh Synod, the English District Synod of Ohio, the English Synod of Ohio, the Canada Synod, the Augustana Synod, the Wisconsin Synod, the Michigan Synod, the Minnesota Synod, and the Illinois Synod.¹² Representatives of the Iowa Synod and of the Ohio Synod were present, but these synods did not join the General Council in 1867. The Ohio Synod raised the "Four Points" — questions which are still being asked in American Lutheranism. They pertained to "Chiliasm," "Mixed Communions," "exchanging pulpits with sectarians," and "secret or unchurchly societies."¹³ The Illinois Synod and the Minnesota Synod withdrew from the General Council in 1871 because the answers of the Council on the "Four Points" were unsatisfactory.¹⁴ The Iowa Synod, too, in 1872, expressed its dissatisfaction with the General Council's stand on these questions.¹⁵ The Wisconsin

¹² S. E. Ochsenford, *Documentary History of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America* (Philadelphia: General Council Publishing House, 1912), p. 147; Bente, *American Lutheranism*, II, 176-227.

The influence of the immigrant Midwest Lutheranism on Lutheranism in the East is analyzed in detail by Carl Mauelshagen, *American Lutheranism Surrenders to Forces of Conservatism* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, Division of Publications, 1936).

¹³ Ochsenford, p. 155 and pp. 328-380.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 235, 336.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 236. The question of pulpit and altar fellowship was not answered satisfactorily for the Iowa Synod.

Synod had withdrawn already in 1869, rejecting "each and every form of **Chiliasm**," warning against membership in secret societies as "anti-Christian and soul endangering," and designating altar and pulpit fellowship with non-Lutherans "as a unionistic practice."¹⁶

Besides the General Synod and the General Council there was a third group which went into the composition of the United Lutheran Church in America on Nov. 16, 1918. This group, the United Synod of the South, organized in 1876, was the product of a union of the General Synod of the South (1863), the Tennessee Synod (1820), and the Holston Synod (1861).¹⁷ These three groups, numbering 45 district synods in North America, in effecting the ULCA brought about the union of a powerful organization within Lutheranism. However, it was more distantly removed from the Missouri Synod than the Midwest synods. In its constitution the ULCA spelled out its doctrinal basis: all the canonical books of the Bible

as the inspired Word of God, the only **infallible** rule of faith and practice; the three ecumenical creeds of Christendom; the Augsburg Confession; the other Lutheran Symbols as in harmony with the Augsburg **Confession**.¹⁸

The action of the ULCA in joining the Federal Council of Churches in 1922 on a "consultative" basis caused a writer of the Missouri Synod to call for free conferences within the Lutheran Church so that there would not be a closer alignment with the Federal Council by the ULCA. These conferences, he wrote, should be continued until, D. v., full unity had been attained.¹⁹

Of greater consequence, as indicated, were the relationships between the Missouri Synod and the synods which entered into the American Lutheran Church in 1930. These were the Buffalo Synod, the Iowa Synod, and the Ohio Synod. It is not the intention here to review the relationships in the period from 1847 to 1887 in any detail. A reminder of principal differences between each of these synods and the Missouri Synod as they persisted into the Middle Period may, however, be in order.

The differences between the Missouri Synod and the Buffalo Synod, centered in questions of church polity. The *Hirtenbrief*

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 332.

¹⁷ Wentz, *Lutheranism in America*, pp. 279ff.; F. B[ente], "The United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXIII (January 1917), 7 to 16 (the article is in German).

The Missouri Synod criticized the ULCA merger of 1918 because the uniting bodies deviated from sound Lutheran practices and allowed errors by men in their midst who denied verbal inspiration, taught co-operation in conversion, tolerated evolutionism, supported the prohibition movement, permitted lodgery, and condoned unionism. [Th.] Gfraebner, "The Merger," *Lutheran Witness*, XXXVII (Oct. 29, 1918), 340-342; *ibid.*, XXXVII (Nov. 12, 1918), 354-356; *ibid.*, XXXVII (Nov. 26, 1918), 372, 373; *ibid.*, XXXVII (Dec. 10, 1918), 386, 387; *ibid.*, XXXVII (Dec. 24, 1918), 403 to 406. *Idem*, "Two Types of Lutheranism," *ibid.*, XXXVIII (June 10, 1919), 180-183.

¹⁸ Wentz, *Lutheranism in America*, p. 284; *Doctrinal Declarations: A Collection of Official Statements on the Doctrinal Position of Various Lutheran Synods in America* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, n. d.) p. 3; also see F. B[ente], "Lehrbasis der Generalsynode seit 1913," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXII (January 1916), 1-7; *ibid.*, LXII (February 1916), 58-69.

¹⁹ F[riedrich] B[ente], "The United Lutheran Church und das Federal Council," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXVIII (August and September 1922), 257; see pp. 248-257 for the entire article.

of J. A. A. Grabau in 1840 had brought about a rejoinder from the Saxons who later participated in the organizing of the Missouri Synod. They disliked the strong clericalism of the Prussian group. A colloquy in 1866 discussed the doctrines of the ministry, the church, ordination, and excommunication, questions which were not downed by the conference. The conference resulted in a split within the Buffalo Synod, some of the pastors joining the Wisconsin Synod.²⁰ The Buffalo Synod was not a large group at any time after that; it numbered only 35 pastors and 6,800 members in 1930, at the time of the organization of the American Lutheran Church. The Missouri Synod, nevertheless, remained conscious of her differences with this church body,²¹ perhaps because the doctrines of the church and the ministry had been faced with almost traumatic acuteness in the early years of her congregations' existence.²²

The Iowa Synod, too, appeared early in

the history of the Missouri Synod. Wilhelm Loehe had a hand in promoting the Iowa Synod, as he had helped the Missouri Synod. The Iowa Synod, in fact, is a product of the differences on the questions of the church and the ministry between Loehe and the Missouri Synod. It was organized in 1854 by G. M. Grossmann, John Deindoerfer, and others, who had been in the Franconian settlements in Michigan — settlements sent over by Loehe that had become organized congregations belonging to the Missouri Synod. To the Missourians it was the *Iowaische Oppositionssynode*.²³ In 1867, the year after the colloquy with the Buffalo Synod, the Missourians met in colloquy with representatives of the Iowa Synod. The position on the Lutheran Symbols, open questions, chiliasm, the doctrine of the Antichrist, the doctrine of Sunday, and the question of the first resurrection were discussed, but not the doctrine of the church and the ministry. No agreement, however, was reached.²⁴

²⁰ Chr. Hochstetter, *Die Geschichte der Evangelisch-lutherischen Missouri-Synode in Nord-Amerika, und ihrer Lehrkämpfe* (Dresden: Heinrich J. Naumann, 1885), pp. 179-278; Roy A. Suelflow, "The Relations of the Missouri Synod with the Buffalo Synod up to 1866," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, XXVII (April 1954), 1-19; *ibid.*, XXVII (July 1954), 57-73; *ibid.*, XXVII (October 1954), 97-132.

²¹ So, e.g., C. F. W. Walther wrote to Pastor Fr. Brunn in Steeden, Nassau, Germany, in 1861: "Unser Kampf mit Buffaio ist ein Kreuz, das uns fort und fort fast zu Boden driicken will." L. Fuerbringer, editor, *Briefe von C. F. W. Walther an seine Freunde, Synodalgenossen und Familienglieder* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1915), I, 160.

²² Hochstetter, pp. 32-60; Walter O. Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953), pp. 507-534; Carl S. Munding, *Gouernment in the Missouri Synod* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1947), pp. 109-162.

²³ This phrase is used by Hochstetter, p. 278. For the Iowa Synod and more specifically Iowa-Missouri relations to 1867 see *ibid.*, pp. 278 to 309; J. Deindoerfer, *Geschichte der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Iowa und anderen Staaten* (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, 1897), pp. 3-23; G. J. Fritzsche, *Quellen und Dokumente zur Geschichte und Lehrstellung der Iowa Synode* (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, 1916), *passim*.

²⁴ Besides references cited in footnote 23 see J. P. Beyer, *Stenographisch aufgezeichnetes Colloquium der Vertreter der Synode von Illinois* [*sic* for Iowa, given correctly on cover! *und der VOA Missouri, Ohio, u. a. St., . . .*] (Chicago: Chicago Union, 1868), pp. 1-175.

Siegmund und Gottfried Fritschel, *Iowa und Missouri: Eine Verteidigung der Lehrstellung der Synode von Iowa gegenüber den Angriffen des Prof. (F. A.) Schmidt* (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, n. d.), was written in 1878 (cf. p. 289). In it Iowa's chiliasm, its *Richtung*, its

The third synod which made up the American Lutheran Church in 1930 was the Ohio Synod. It is the oldest of the three synods, having been organized already in 1818, a Western outpost of the Pennsylvania Ministerium. However, in 1820 it refused to join the General Synod. The influence of Paul Henkel, and later Andrew Henkel, was in the direction of Lutheran confessionalism, a tendency strengthened by W. F. Lehmann and Matthias Loy in the second half of the century. The free conferences of the 1850s helped to draw at least 3 portion of the Ohio Synod clergy closer to the Missouri Synod. It participated, as did the Missouri Synod, in the preliminary convention of the General Council (1866),²⁵ but did not join the council in the following year, although its delegates were present.²⁶ It was the Ohio Synod that raised the question of the "Four Points" in 1867 and forced the protracted discussion of them in the convention of the following year.²⁷ In this year (1868) fraternal relations were established with the Missouri Synod,²⁸ the first step toward the

formation of the Synodical Conference in 1872, for which the Ohio Synod gave the impetus.²⁹

Between 1868 and 1880 the Ohio Synod and the Missouri Synod enjoyed fraternal relationships. It was the Ohio Synod Seminary which in 1878 awarded C. F. W. Walther an honorary doctor of divinity degree.³⁰ It was Lehmann who became president of the Synodical Conference in 1873, a position to which he was re-elected for one-year terms in 1874, 1875, 1877, and 1879, a position he held at the time of his death (1880), in the midst of the *Gnadenwahlstreit*.³¹

This controversy on election caused a breach between the Ohio Synod and the Missouri Synod which has remained until the present time. The breach is one of the major factors which helped shape the course of Lutheranism in America in the period between 1887 and 1912, because the relationships between the Missouri Synod and the Ohio Synod remained essentially unfavorable throughout the period.

The Norwegian Synod, too, withdrew from the Synodical Conference because of the controversy on predestination.

position on the symbols, and its open questions are defended.

²⁵ Ochsenford, p. 133.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 148, 154.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 328 ff. A. G[raebner], "Zur Geschichte der vier Punkte," *Lehre und Wehre*, XXXIV (June 1888), 167—173; *ibid.*, XXXIV (July and August 1888), 217—224; *ibid.*, XXXIV (September 1888), 257—264; *ibid.*, XXXIV (October 1888), 302—310; *ibid.*, XXXIV (November and December 1888), 342 to 354.

²⁸ *Proceedings*, Joint Ohio Synod, 1868, pp. 32, 33; see Paul E. Kretzmann, "Documents Regarding Church Affiliation and Organic Union in the Lutheran Church of America," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, IV (October 1931), 88, 89; *ibid.*, V (October 1932), 109, 110.

²⁹ *Denkschrift, enthaltend eine eingehende Darlegung der Gründe weshalb die zur Synodical-Conferenz der evangel.-luther. Kirche von Nord-Amerika zutretenden Synoden sich nicht an eine der hiezulande schon bestehenden lutherisch benannten Verbindungen von Synoden haben anschliessen können* (Columbus: Schulze und Gassmann, 1871), p. 3.

³⁰ See file on "honorary degree" in Walther papers. Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis.

³¹ *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1873, p. 31; *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1874, p. 54; *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1875, p. 36; *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1877, p. 52; *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1878, p. 68; *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1879, p. 51.

. . . not because of disagreement in doctrine with the other synods, but because it was hoped that a settlement of the controversy which raged within the Synod itself thereby might more easily be reached. Since the discussions in the Synodical Conference were carried on in the German language, which was not understood by the majority of the Norwegians, it was feared membership in this body might complicate matters and make a settlement more difficult.³²

This Synod was organized in 1853; early in its history it established fraternal relations with the Missouri Synod, utilizing its Seminary for the training of pastors, and joining with the Ohio and Missouri synods in the organization of the Synodical Conference.³³

The Wisconsin Synod, which now includes the Minnesota Synod, is the only charter member of the Synodical Conference, besides the Missouri Synod, which has retained its membership in that body. The Illinois Synod joined the Missouri Synod and became an integral part of it (1880). By 1872 earlier unionistic and doctrinally loose tendencies within the Wisconsin Synod had given way to a stanch Lutheran confessionalism.³⁴ The

Wisconsin Synod remained solidly on the side of the Missouri Synod in the controversy on election.³⁵

Regarding the controversy on election it need only be pointed out now that the basic question at issue was, as Charles Porterfield Krauth of the General Council phrased it from a vantage point outside the controversy itself, "Is our faith a cause of God's election, or an effect of it?"³⁶ The term *intuitu fidei*, as used by older Lutheran dogmaticians, was interpreted, misinterpreted, defended, and attacked in the controversy.³⁷ Missouri's formulation of the "Thirteen Theses,"³⁸ was approved both by the Missouri Synod³⁹ and by the Synodical Conference: "The 'we believe, teach, and confess' of each of the theses has the ring of a creedal statement.

Looking back, this is the situation in 1887. The General Synod (1820), the General Council (1867), and the United Synod of the South (1876), the Iowa (1854), Ohio (1818), and Buffalo (1845) synods, the Norwegian Synod (1851), and the synods of the Synodical Conference

consin and Other States. 1850—1950 (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1951), pp. 13—26.

³⁵ *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1882, p. 64; *Continuing in His Grace*, p. 79.

³⁶ Jacobs, p. 505, quoted from *Lutheran Church Review*, III, 68 ff.

³⁷ No attempt will be made in any way to cite the literature on this controversy. A definitive study of the controversy is a desideratum.

³⁸ They are found most easily in Erwin L. Lueker, ed. *Lutheran Cyclopedia* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954), pp. 1057, 1058, sub "Thirteen Theses."

³⁹ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1881, p. 41.

⁴⁰ *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1882, p. 79, ". . . dass sich die Synodalkonferenz zu den dreizehn Thesen . . . von der Gnadenwahl bekenne, . . ." In italics in the original.

³² Chr. Anderson, "Historical Sketch of the Beginnings, Growth and Development of the Norwegian Synod," *Grace for Grace: Brief History of the Norwegian Synod*, ed. S. C. Ylvisaker (Mankato, Minn.: Lutheran Synod Book Co., 1943), pp. 61 f.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 57 ff.; S. C. Ylvisaker, "The Missouri Synod and the Norwegians," *Ebenezer*, ed. W. H. T. Dau; augmented ed. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1922), 264—272; Gerhard Belgum, "The Old Norwegian Synod," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University, 1957, on microfilm in Concordia Historical Institute.

³⁴ Continuing in *His Word; The History of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wis-*

(1872), chiefly the Missouri (1847) and the Wisconsin (1850) synods, were the chief Lutheran church bodies in America. The doctrines of election, the church and the ministry, confessional subscription, and the "Four Points" were the chief issues which separated them.

The appearance in 1889 of Grosse's popularly written comparative symbolics in 132 pages highlighted the doctrinal differences among the Lutherans. He began with the Buffalo Synod, its "false doctrines" (*falsche Lehre*) concerning the church, the office of the keys, the ministry, ordination, synods, and church government. He then turned to the Iowa Synod. Its false doctrines were: Chiliasm, concerning the Antichrist, open questions, the ministry and church government, free will, conversion, and election, and its stance toward the Lutheran Confessions. The Ohio Synod taught falsely, according to Grosse, on conversion, justification, election, or predestination, and the certainty of election or salvation; moreover, its readiness to take doctrinal formulations of the fathers as a foundation for faith was scored. The General Council was called a unionistic church body, which tolerated false doctrines concerning conversion and justification, condoned pulpit fellowship with sectarian churches, altar fellowship with the heterodox, and permitted lodge membership even among its pastors. In addition, its teachings on church government were regarded as false and dangerous. The General Synod, so Grosse maintained, was not truly Lutheran in its intent and doctrinal position, thoroughly unionistic in its practices.⁴¹

⁴¹ C. Johannes Grosse, *Unterscheidungslehren der hauptsächlichsten sich lutherisch nennenden*

On behalf of the Iowa Synod, at least, an attempt was made to refute the charges of false doctrine levied by Grosse.⁴² Both the Iowa and the Ohio synods, however, were regarded as harboring "false prophets" and false teachings in 1905. By that time the question of the *analogia fidei* had been added to the doctrinal differences between these synods and the Missouri Synod. The question of the *analogia fidei* deals with the question whether the clear Word of God alone is the source and norm of faith or whether it is subject to enlightened reason.⁴³ In the "Lehre von der Bekräftigung, Gnadenwahl und Schriftanalogie sind die Ohioer und Iowaer falsche Propheten," it was said.⁴⁴ There were ample reasons, it was stated and detailed, why the Missourians should avoid them.⁴⁵

It is not at all surprising that the Iowa and Ohio synods should attempt to reach doctrinal agreement and perhaps organic union. It is surprising that the latter was not accomplished until 1930. Meanwhile a series of conferences and theses prepared the way for such a union.

In July 1893 representatives of the Ohio and of the Iowa synods met in Michigan City, Ind. They adopted six theses dealing

Synoden sowie der namhaftesten Sectenkirchen in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika (St. Louis: Lutherischer Concordia-Verlag, 1889), pp. 1—57.

⁴² S. Fritschel, *Die Unterscheidungslehren der Synoden von Iowa und Missouri* (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, n. d.), 94 pages, according to p. 3 a reprint from the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* of 1891 and 1892.

⁴³ E. B[ente], "Warum können wir keine gemeinsamen Gebetsgottesdienste mit Ohioern und Iowaern veranstalten und abhalten?" *Lehre und Wehre*, LI (March 1905), 98 f.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 98—115, especially pp. 103 to 115.

with the Church, the Ministry, the Symbols, Open Questions, Chiliasm and the Antichrist, Predestination and Conversion."⁴⁶ Especially the last thesis was directed against the Missouri Synod and was condemned within the Missouri Synod.⁴⁷ This condemnation, however, seems not to have been on the official level. The same theses were discussed again and adopted with some changes⁴⁸ when representatives of the Ohio and Iowa synods met in Toledo, Ohio, Feb. 13-15, 1907.⁴⁹ They were promptly dubbed "*Die Toledoer Unions-thesen*" in Missouri circles. It was predicted that eventually the Ohio Synod would enter into church fellowship with the General Council and the General Synod.⁵⁰ The Iowa Synod accepted the theses in convention assembled in Mendota, Ill., June 20-25 of the same year, and declared church fellowship with the Ohio Synod.⁵¹

However, the Ohio Synod, meeting in Appleton, Wis., in 1908, resolved that it could not enter into pulpit and altar fel-

lowship with the Iowa Synod, because of Iowa's friendly relations with the General Council?" The Iowa Synod gave an explanation to the Ohio Synod, admitting that it had exchanged delegates as an expression of church fellowship and pleading for fellowship with the Ohio Synod.⁵³ This meeting at Richmond (1910) welcomed the statement of the Iowa Synod, acknowledged it as an orthodox Lutheran body, but pleaded for the removal of certain differences in doctrine before altar and pulpit fellowship was established.⁵⁴

In 1912 the representatives of these two bodies met again in Toledo. The question of pulpit and altar fellowship between Iowa and the General Council still caused misgivings on the part of the Ohio Synod.⁵⁵ N. Rasmussen of the Ohio Synod issued a pamphlet entitled *Can We Unite With Iowa?* He stated the Ohio and Iowa synods agreed on open questions and a *quatenus* subscription to the confessions. The question of the Antichrist is not divisive; other points, he said, showed no significant differences.⁵⁶

In 1918 altar and pulpit fellowship was

⁴⁶ F[rantz] P[ieper], "Das Colloquium der Synoden von Ohio und Iowa," *ibid.*, XXXIX (September 1893), 257-264.

⁴⁷ *Idem*, "Zur Beurtheilung des ohioisch-iowaischen Colloquiums," *ibid.*, XXXIX (October 1893), 289-293.

⁴⁸ So Meisinger of Baden as quoted by F. B[ente] in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LIII (November 1907), 518 f. The doctrine of the Antichrist was not included in the Toledo theses.

⁴⁹ *Doctrinal Declarations*, pp. 5-7; the date 1908, however, should be corrected to 1907.

G. J. Fritschel, ed., *Quellen und Dokumente*, No. 114, pp. 362-364.

⁵⁰ F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LIII (June 1907), 278-284.

⁵¹ *Idem*, "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LIII (October 1907), 469-471.

⁵² *Idem*, "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LIV (October 1908), 462-465.

⁵³ From the *Kirchenzeitung* [1910], pp. 543 f. as reported by F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVI (September 1910), 409-411.

⁵⁴ From the *Kirchenblatt* (Sept. 24, 1910), as quoted by F. B[ente] in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVI (December 1910), 561.

⁵⁵ E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LVIII (June 1912), 270, 271, 'with a quotation from the *Kirchenzeitung*, *Lehre und Wehre*, LVIII (September 1912), 414, 415.

⁵⁶ Summarized by E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LIX (January 1913), 32-35.

declared between the Ohio and the Iowa synods.⁵⁷ Doctrinal agreement between the Iowa and Buffalo synods was declared in 1919.⁵⁸ In this year representatives meeting in Chicago adopted (March 11, 1919) the *Chicago Theses*. The Augustana Synod, the Iowa Synod, the Joint Synod of Ohio, the Lutheran Free Church, the Norwegian Church of America, the United Danish Church, and the United Lutheran Church were represented at this meeting.⁵⁹ The theses deal with general questions of Christology and soteriology.

This year 1918 (or the years 1917, 1918, and 1919) must be regarded as crucial in the history of the Lutheran Church in America, even though they merely divide the Middle Period in the internal history of the Missouri Synod into two parts. It is not only that altar and pulpit fellowship was declared between the Iowa and the Ohio synods; in 1917 the Norwegian synods had united.

The union movement among the Norwegians was of momentous importance to the Missouri Synod and governed its actions to a greater extent than has been readily admitted or recognized. The close

⁵⁷ [Th.] G[raebner] in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LXIV (October 1918), 473 and 474.

⁵⁸ *Der Lutheraner*, LXXV (Dec. 2, 1919), 380.

⁵⁹ *Doctrinal Declaration*, pp. 22, 23, for the theses. These theses must be distinguished from the (Chicago) Intersynodical Theses of 1928. See also [Th.] G[raebner] in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXV (April 1919), 183—187; Lueker, ed., *Lutheran Encyclopedia*, p. 193.

G. M. Bruce, *The Union Documents of the Evangelical Lutheran Church with a Historical Survey of the Union Movement* (Minneapolis: Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 1948), pp. 84, 85.

fraternal ties which had existed between the Missouri Synod and the Norwegian Synod before the *Gnadenwahlstreit* continued, even though they were not as extensive as previously. In 1903, e.g., the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Synod, Concordia Seminary conferred honorary degrees — a rare event in those days — on Laur. Larsen, U. V. Koren, and H. A. Stub; the Norwegian Seminary reciprocated with honorary degrees for Francis Pieper and A. L. Graebner.⁶⁰ Between 1903 and 1917, however, the Norwegian Synod drew closer to the elements within its own ethnic group that had been antagonistic to the Missouri Synod.

In 1887 this antagonism to the Missouri Synod crystallized in the formation of the Anti-Missouri Brotherhood. To find the roots of this antagonism merely in the controversy on election or in ethnic differences would be to disregard the earlier controversy on slavery among the Norwegians, perhaps even the controversy on lay preaching, and the pietistic leanings among some Norwegians. In 1876 another Norwegian group had effected a reorganization out of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (the Eielsen Synod, so named after its leader, Elling Eielsen). This reorganized group chose the name Hauge's Evangelical Lutheran Synod, after the influential Norwegian layman Hans Nielsen Hauge (d. 1824). The Norwegian Augustana Synod (1870) and the Conference for the Norwegian-Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (1870) had not been orientated toward the Missouri Synod. When, therefore, the anti-Missourians in the Norwegian Synod looked for partners, they found them among these two groups.

⁶⁰ Ylvisaker, in *Ebenezer*, ed. Dau, p. 263.

even though the Hauge Synod and the smaller **Eielsen** Synod did not join them. In 1890 the United Norwegian Lutheran Church was organized.⁶¹

Already before 1890, however, efforts had been made among the various Norwegian groups toward union. In the 1870s, perhaps because of the free conference of the 1850s,⁶² the Norwegian Synod promoted free conferences among the Norwegians. The Rushford (Minnesota) conference and the Rock Prairie (Wisconsin) conference did not settle differences in doctrine among the Norwegians. Yet regional conferences in 1877 and 1878 served to prepare the way for union meetings in the 1880s. The St. Ansgar (Iowa) conference in 1881, the Roland (Iowa) conference in 1882, and the **Holden** (Goodhue County, Minn.) conference in 1883 were free conferences in which the doctrines of objective justification ("justification of the world"), faith, and absolution were discussed. The free conferences then gave way to joint meetings as the result of the election of official committees to carry on negotiations with the other synods by the Norwegian Synod, the Norwegian-Augustana Synod, the Norwegian Conference, and the Hauge Synod. Joint meetings were held at Chicago in 1885, in **Goodhue County** (Minn.) in 1886, and at **Willmar** (Minn.) in 1887. At the **Willmar** meeting the doctrine of justification ("justification of the world")

was discussed. The year 1887, however, was the year in which the Anti-Missourians left the Norwegian Synod because of the controversy on election.⁶³ The meetings at Eau Claire (Wis.) in 1888, at Scandinavia (Wis.) in the same year, and Minneapolis (1890), which brought about the formation of the United Lutheran Church," belong to the series of conferences and meetings which continued even after 1890.

No: all of the meetings need be mentioned. It is important to note, however, that in 1889 the Minnesota District of the Norwegian Synod adopted a memorial, petitioning the Synod to continue efforts to bring about a union of all Norwegian synods. A resolution of the Synod accepted the essentials of the memorial. Thus in 1890 the initiative for an eventual union between the Norwegian Synod and the United Synod already had been launched by the former. The 1892 meeting in **Willmar** (Minn.) showed that the questions of prayer fellowship, the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the place of the *Book of Concord* had to be added to the questions which divided the Norwegian Lutherans. A free conference at **Lanesboro** (Minn.) in 1897 showed up differences in the doctrines of conversion and election. In 1899 two free conferences, one at **Austin** (Minn.) in January," and the second at **Northwood** (Iowa) in October,⁶⁶ continued the discussions on conversion and election,

In 1900 the district conventions of the

⁶¹ E. Clifford Nelson and Eugene L. Fevold, *The Lutheran Church Among Norwegian Americans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960) in two volumes tell the story in detail; see the review of this work by Robert Preus in the *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, XXXIII (January 1961), 126, 127. Bruce, pp. 1-6.

⁶² *Supra*, footnote 11.

⁶³ Nelson and Fevold, I, 302-335.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 3-37.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 129-138.

⁶⁶ *Lehre und Wehre*, XLV (December 1899), 378 f.

Norwegian Synod invited the district presidents and the theological faculties of the United Norwegian Synod to join their compeers in colloquy. Two meetings were hold. The talks were broken off; however, conversations were resumed again in 1905, when the Hauge Synod, the Norwegian Synod, and the United Norwegian Synod met to discuss doctrinal differences. A set of theses on absolution, drawn up in 1874, were discussed, accepted by the committee (1906), and ratified by the three synods which they represented (1912). In that same year (1906) theses on lay preaching were adopted by the committees and later (1912) ratified. The following year (1907) theses on the call, and a year later (1908) theses on conversion, were agreed on.⁶⁷ All of these theses, however, lack antitheses, and the lack of antitheses, it was held, was a serious defect.⁶⁸ Most important was the action in 1908, when the United, the Haugean, and the Norwegian Synod representatives met in Chicago. The theses regarding the call and conversion were accepted for submission to the bodies represented. The representatives of the Norwegian Synod, as visitors, explained to the Synodical Conference (in August 1908) that their Synod would take no action on these theses and that these theses still lacked antitheses! Antitheses, how-

ever, were not produced. In 1910 these 1908 theses were endorsed by the Union Committee. Union was delayed when the theses on election, prepared by H. G. Stub, caused protracted discussions (five meetings between 1908 and 1910).

Within the Missouri Synod, Stoeckhardt scrutinized the theses on calling and conversion and on election⁷⁰ and found them "ambiguous and misleading."⁷¹ He warned against indifference and unionism.⁷² Pieper pointed out that already in 1884 he had voiced objections to a set of theses drafted in the Norwegian Synod, which were materially very similar to the 1908 theses.⁷³ The Wisconsin Synod *Quartalschrift*, too, found the theses defective.⁷⁴

However, when the Union Committee of the three Norwegian bodies met in Minneapolis (Dec. 13, 1910), another set of theses [Eastvold's theses] were also presented. The Hauge Synod and the United Synod approved these theses. The Norwegian Synod withdrew from the meeting.⁷⁵ Nelson dubbed it "a theological log jam."

p. 4, that J. Nordby and O. E. Brandt were present.

⁷⁰ G. St[oeckhardt] and F. P[ieper], "Beleuchtung der norwegischen Vereinigungsthesen," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVI (October 1910), 433 to 456.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 441.

⁷² Ibid., p. 456.

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 456-466 with reference to *Lehre und Wehre*, XXX (May 1884), 183, n. 1; XXX (June 1884), 212, n. 1; see also references to Koren's position, *ibid.*, XXX (May 1884), 170-183; *ibid.*, XXX (June 1884), 209-212.

⁷⁴ J. Schaller "Die Vereinigungssache bei den norwegischen Synoden," *Theologische Quart&f*, VIII (April 1911), 81-98.

⁷⁵ D. [Dau?], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVII (January 1911), 31 f., with reference to the official minutes published in *Kirketidende* and in *Lutheraneren*. *Grace for*

⁶⁷ Anderson, "Historical Sketch, etc.," *Grace for Grace*, ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 92-102; pp. 156 to 160 (theses on absolution); pp. 137-140 (on lay preaching); p. 193. Nelson and Fevold, II, Appendix C, pp. 344-355, also have the theses. Bruce, pp. 28-38.

⁶⁸ Anderson, "Historical Sketch, etc.," *Grace for Grace*, ed. Ylvisaker, p. 97.

⁶⁹ F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LV (February 1909), 77, 78. The Synodical Conference *Proceedings, 1908*, do not report this incident, although they record,

In 1912, nevertheless, a basis for agreement was reached by the new union committees elected in the previous year. "Two forms of presentation" on election were given (Feb. 22, 1912) in the *Opgjøer*, the Madison Agreement, the one according to Article XI of the Formula of Concord and the other according to Pontoppidan.⁷⁶ Pieper criticized it almost immediately for allowing *intuitu fidei finalis*.⁷⁷

The union movement among the Norwegians, indeed, caused Pieper to take another long hard look at the differences among Lutherans because of the doctrine of election.⁷⁸ He voiced the hope that all Lutherans would agree fully on *sola gratia*. "Sind wir erst wieder in der 'Kernfrage' einig, so dürfte bald die Einigkeit in den übrigen Punkten folgen." ⁷⁹ in 1913 his *Zur Einigung der amerikanisch-lutherischen Kirche in der Lehre von der Bekehrung und Gnadenwahl* appeared in both the original version and in a translation by W. H. T. Dau.⁸⁰

The Madison Agreement was soon rati-

fied by the Hauge Synod and the United Norwegian Church. The district conventions of the Norwegian Synod accepted the theses. To the more general satisfaction expressed in the Lutheran periodicals, the *Lehre und Wehre* remarked that the action seemed a compromise and a surrender.⁸¹ The mystery between the *universalis* and *sola gratia* and the *cur alii prae aliis* remained.⁸² The Synodical Conference convention of this year asked the Norwegian Synod to remove the thesis which permitted the teaching of the second form, to formulate an antithesis which would indict every statement finding a cause of conversion in man, and to clarify the earlier theses on conversion and election. A committee, consisting of W. Dau, F. Pieper, and J. Schaller, was appointed to present these points to the Norwegian Synod.⁸³

Bente called the *Opgjøer* "ambiguous" and unionistic? Pardieck found a mixture of fanaticism, indifference, lack of seriousness, and misunderstanding among the Norwegians.⁸⁴ Within the Norwegian

Grace, ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 193, 194. Nelson and Fevold, II, 139—169.

⁷⁶ Doctrinal *Declarations*, No. 6, pp. 8—10. Grace for Grace, ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 194—198; *Ebenezer*, pp. 272-274. Nelson and Fevold, II, 169—182; Appendix C., pp. 356, 358. Bruce, pp. 38-57 for the Madison Agreement; pp. 62 to 67 the Austin Agreement.

⁷⁷ F. P[ieper], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVIII (May 1912), 222, 223.

⁷⁸ Idem, "Welch Schwierigkeiten es für Lutheraner macht, in der Lehre von der Gnadenwahl, wie sie in der Schrift gelehrt und im Bekenntnis unserer Kirche bekannt ist, nicht einig zu sein," *ibid.*, LVIII (May 1912), 193 to 198; *ibid.* LVIII (June 1912), 241—251.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 250, 251.

⁸⁰ Both published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.

⁸¹ E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVIII (August 1912), 367. Grace for Grace, ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 99 to 105.

⁸² *Lehre und Wehre*, LVIII (August 1912), 369.

⁸³ E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LVIII (September 1912), 413. *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1912, pp. 14—24.

⁸⁴ F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVIII (November 1912), 515. Cf. pp. 511-515 for additional views.

Bente was faulted for reading more into the journal items, especially in *Amerika*, than they actually said. See F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LIX (February 1913), 81, 82.

⁸⁵ E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschicht-

Synod itself doubts and misgivings were mollified by statements that the *Opgjoer* did not alter the doctrines of conversion and election as professed by that Synod.⁸⁶ Repeatedly the plea was made within the Missouri Synod that the *Opgjoer* be tested thoroughly as to its Scripturalness and that all ambiguity be removed from it.⁸⁷

The events which led from the Madison Agreement in 1912 to the Austin Settlement in 1916 and the merger in 1917 must be summarized briefly. The minority group within the Norwegian Synod at the special convention in 1913 was organized more effectively for the 1914 convention. The special convention of 1915 postponed action on the merger until the 1916 convention. On resolutions for merger in this 1916 convention the minority mustered 203 votes against 520 votes. Then followed the Austin Agreement and the consummation of the merger.⁸⁸

What about the reaction of the Missouri Synod to the moves within the Norwegian Synod between 1912 and 1917? Selected parts of Pieper's *Zur Einigung* were circulated among the pastors of the Norwegian Synod in a Norse translation (by M. F. Wiese).⁸⁹ The 1914 convention of the Synodical Conference heard the cor-

respondence between its committee and the church council of the Norwegian Synod. The council declined permission to the Synodical Conference delegates to appear before their body. It elected a special committee to deal with the committee of the Synodical Conference. The Synodical Conference committee stated that it had no instructions for such a procedure, but Dau and Pieper offered to meet with the Norwegian committee as private persons upon their own responsibility. No meeting resulted. The Norwegian Synod endorsed the action of its council (1913); the Synodical Conference, of its committee (1914). It appointed another committee with broad powers to deal with the Norwegian Synod. Pieper, Dau, and Schlueter were members of this committee.⁹⁰

The articles of agreement between the three Norwegian church bodies of 1914 are to be distinguished from the *Opgjoer*. The former are constitutional. They provided, e.g., that the churches would not co-operate with those "who do not share the same faith and confession." This constitutional provision meant a separation from the Synodical Conference. Graebner said.⁹¹ The Norwegian Synod's *Lutheran Herald* made of this remark an excommunication. In reply Graebner stated that the Norwegians were still regarded as brethren, of the household of faith, but that they were being warned against taking a step that would lead to separation.⁹²

liches," *ibid.*, LVIII (December 1912), 563. Also see pp. 562, 564.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, LIX (January 1913), 32; *ibid.*, LIX (May 1913), 227.

⁸⁷ E. g., F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LIX (February 1913); E. P[ar-dieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LIX (April 1913), 176, with a quotation from the *Herald*, endorsing the action of the Madison-Chicago special conference of the Norwegian Synod asking for a "basis of union clearer than the (Madison) Agreement."

⁸⁸ *Grace for Grace*, ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 101 to 110; Nelson and Fevold, II, 183-225.

⁸⁹ *Grace for Grace*, ed. Ylvisaker, p. 112.

⁹⁰ *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1914, pp. 33-44.

⁹¹ [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXI (March 1915), 132.

⁹² *Ibid.*, LXI (July 1915), 324-326; which also quoted the *Lutheran Witness* to the same

Between 1914 and 1916 the efforts of the Synodical Conference committee to meet with the committee of the Norwegian Synod were futile. Nevertheless, the 1916 convention instructed the committee to proceed with conferences ("alle ihm sonst noch zweckentsprechend erscheinenden Lehrbesprechungen").⁹³ When the Synodical Conference met again in 1920, no such meeting had been held because the Norwegian church council regarded a colloquium at this time inappropriate. "Our people need peace and rest."⁹⁴ In 1918 the small, nonmerging minority organized into the Norwegian Synod of the American Lutheran Church; in 1920 this "Little Nor-

effect and the reply to the *Lutheran Standard*, *ibid.*, pp. 326-328.

The United Norwegian Church (*Forenede Kirke*) was characterized as synergistic, indifferent to pure doctrine or doctrinal differences, and demonstrated Reformed tendencies in its teachings regarding Sunday, chiliasm, the inspiration of Scripture, and in its revivalistic activities. Nor was the Hauge Synod regarded as being in line with the traditional teachings of the Lutheran Church, particularly in its attitude toward lay preaching. The compromise of the *Opgjøer* made it unacceptable. This was the position taken by Th. Graebner in a rather thorough examination of the *Forenede Kirke* and the Haugeans. [Th.] G[raebner], "Lehrstellung der Forenede Kirche und der Hauge-synode," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXI (March 1915), 97-108; *ibid.*, LXI (April 1915), 200-210.

The terminology of the *intuitu fidei* doctrine in the *Opgjøer* was a toleration of this doctrine not in "the sense of Missouri." This doctrine was to make room for a correct disposition of a person, at least a person's readiness to believe, as the cause of **his election**. Wiese's pamphlet in 1915 showed **the** compromising character of the Madison Agreement. [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXI (June 1915), 278-280.

⁹³ *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1916, pp. 62-79.

⁹⁴ *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1920, p. 20.

wegian Synod" was accepted into membership in the Synodical Conference.⁹⁵ They had been counseled by the Synodical Conference committee (at a meeting in the Aberdeen Hotel in St. Paul on June 5, 1916) to testify; propriety, however, forbade Dau and Pieper to participate in the planning of an opposition organization.⁹⁶ In 1917 President Pfotenhauer reported a "grave" status among the Norwegians, but no action was taken by this Missouri Synod convention.⁹⁷

However, between 1912 and 1920 the union movement among the Norwegian bodies also renewed within the Missouri Synod theological questions connected with the doctrine of election. Election to faith, it was shown again, was the Scriptural teaching.⁹⁸ With this question was coupled the whole question of Lutheran unity.⁹⁹ Pieper's *Zur Einigung der amerikanisch-lutherischen Kirche in der Lehre von der Bekehrung und Gnadenuahl* belongs to the stream of Lutheran union movements in 1913. It was written specifically, as the subtitle states, *Im Anschluss an die norwegischen Vereinigungssätze und deren Kritiken*. Pieper compared *Opgjøer* very carefully with Article XI of the Formula and the judgments of the old dogmati-

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 22, 23. Grace for *Grace*, ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 115-122.

⁹⁶ *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1920, pp. 19, 20.

⁹⁷ *Proceedings*. Mo. Synod, 1917, p. 8.

⁹⁸ [L. Aug.] H[eerbot]h, "Die 'Wahl zum Glauben' ausdrücklich in der Schrift gelehrt," *Lehre und Wehre*, LIX (October 1913), 433 to 439.

⁹⁹ Pieper himself stated that it was "historisch stark veranlastet" by the Norwegian union theses. F[rantz] P[ieper]. "Wird Einigkeit werden?" *ibid.*, LX (February 1914), 50.

cians.¹⁰⁰ He pleaded: Unity in the truth must be sought; *sola gratia* and *gratia universalis*, the two fundamental doctrines of conversion and election, are to be maintained in their purity.¹⁰¹ The explanation of the *discretio personarum* is not the *verschiedenes Verhalten*.¹⁰² In an irenic but firm spirit, as also Lutheran writers of other synods admitted, Pieper pleaded for an adherence to the teachings of Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions as the basis for true unity.¹⁰³

The charges of Calvinism, lack of charity, and a want of spirituality were brought against Missouri.¹⁰⁴ Not the Norwegians — they largely disregarded Pieper's *Zur Einigung* — but the representatives of the Ohio and Iowa Synod took up the plea, in some instances were ready to drop these charges, and asked that the white flag be hoisted and peace declared. Party considerations, *Parteigeist*, alone hindered the possibility of unity in doctrine and practice, they declared.¹⁰⁵

Pieper's plea for unity in the Lutheran

¹⁰⁰ Pieper, *Zur Einigung*, pp. 27-9 1.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 11—13; E. P[ardieck], "Zum 'richtigen Verhalten,'" *Lehre und Wehre*, LIX (December 1913), 529, 548.

¹⁰² Emphasized by F. P[ieper] in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LX (January 1914), 34 f.

¹⁰³ F[rantz] P[ieper], "Wird Einigkeit werden?" *ibid.*, LX (February 1914), 49—60; *ibid.*, LX (March 1914), 97-105; *ibid.*, LX (May 1914), 193—201; *ibid.*, LX (June 1914), 241—256.

Also see the editorial, "Lutheran Union," *Lutheran Witness*, XXXII (June 19, 1913), 97.

¹⁰⁴ See the quotation from the *Lutheran* in *Lehre und Wehre*, LX (March 1914), 97—105; from the *Lutheran Herald* in *ibid.*, LX (April 1914), 178—181.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., LX (June 1914), 25, as quoted by Pieper.

Church in America had a greater response in the circles of the General Council, for instance, than it did among the Norwegians. The General Synod's *Lutheran* pleaded for spiritual unity ("Our Church in America at this moment is forgetting that the underlying preliminary to Church unity is not wholly doctrinal, nor practical, but spiritual").¹⁰⁶ Agreement with other Lutheran bodies, Pieper replied, depended on agreement in doctrine and practice,¹⁰⁷ especially agreement in the doctrines of conversion and election; the repudiation of the explanation for election in differing attitudes ("*verschiedene menschliche Verhalten*") must first be made.¹⁰⁸

To the cluster of Lutheran mergers, around 1917 and 1918 the formation of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States (1919) must be added. The first Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin was founded in May 1850;¹⁰⁹ the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Michigan and Other States was organized in December 1860;¹¹⁰ the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Minnesota was organized in 1860.¹¹¹ In 1892 these three synods formed the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and Other States.¹¹² This was not, however, a complete merger. The Nebraska mission field grew into the Nebraska District and then in 1904 into the Nebraska Synod.¹¹³ By 1917 a more closely knit

¹⁰⁶ Quoted by F[rantz] P[ieper], "Wird Einigkeit werden?" *ibid.*, LX (February 1914), 58.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., LX (March 1914), 103.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., LX (June 1914), 251 f.

¹⁰⁹ *Continuing in His Word*, p. 14.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 85.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 101.

¹¹² Ibid., p. 109.

¹¹³ Ibid., p. 115.

union of this group was needed. The semi-independent synods, Minnesota and Nebraska, surrendered the measure of autonomy they had enjoyed. The revised constitution was accepted in **1919**, and the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States came into being.¹¹⁴

Other plans had been considered, among them the plan for a unification or amalgamation of all the synods of the Synodical Conference.¹¹⁵ This plan was advanced in 1914, and a Missouri Synod committee had been called into being to work out, if possible, a plan of union with the other Synodical Conference synods.¹¹⁶ A committee of the Wisconsin Synod agreed with the Missouri committee on amalgamation, but the moves within the Wisconsin Synod stymied these plans.¹¹⁷

In 1918, too, the National Lutheran Council was organized, a major move

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 37. See also Wentz, *Lutheranism in America*, pp. 272-278.

¹¹⁵ E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LIX (August 1913), 370, 371.

¹¹⁶ Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1914, p. 175.

¹¹⁷ Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1917, Germ. ed., pp. 152, 153; Engl. ed., pp. 75, 76.

toward associating Lutherans in an overarching organizational structure. Member bodies included the synods which went to make up the ULCA, the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Ohio, the Iowa, and Buffalo synods — the Iowa Synod withdrew in 1920; the Buffalo Synod, in 1925; the ALC became a member in 1930 — and a number of smaller Lutheran synods. The synods of the Synodical Conference did not join.¹¹⁸ No moves were made between 1918 and 1932 to bring the Missouri Synod into the National Lutheran Council. In general the attitude within the Missouri Synod toward the council remained critical.¹¹⁹ The organization, however, caused less apprehension than did the union of the Norwegian bodies in 1918.

¹¹⁸ Wentz, *Lutheranism in America*, pp. 302 to 308; [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXIV (November 1918), 520—523; *ibid.*, LXV (February 1919), 86—89.

¹¹⁹ See, e.g., E. P[ardieck] in *Der Lutheraner*, LXXV (Dec. 30, 1919), 427, 428. [Th.] G[raebner] said: "Our criticism of the National Lutheran Council has never been a sweeping and unreserved condemnation," *Lutheran Witness*, XL (April 12, 1921), 118. The first part of the sentence was in bold face type in the original.

(To be concluded)

The Historical Background of "A Brief Statement"

(Concluded)

By CARL S. MEYER

The union negotiations among the Norwegians served to take most of the Norwegian Synod's members out of direct fellowship with the Missourians. The consummation of the Norwegian union seemed, on the other hand, to direct the Ohio and Iowa synods toward each other and possibly toward the Missouri Synod. There were other factors, of course, which tended to bring about a partial temporary amelioration of the animosity between the synods. One of these factors was a series of free conferences held in the early years of the twentieth century.

Sporadic conferences were held in the 1890s. Two such conferences in Canada in 1872—perhaps there were more in later years—were regarded as being directed against the Missouri Synod.¹²⁰ Five years or so later free conferences were held between members of the Ohio Synod and the Missouri Synod, entirely private in character.¹²¹ In May 1902, a free conference was held in Beloit, Wis.¹²² These conferences

are insignificant when compared with the free conferences held in Watertown, Wis., in 1903, Milwaukee in 1903, Detroit in 1904, and Fort Wayne in 1905.

The first of these free conferences, held in Watertown, Wis., April 29 and 30, 1903, as is true of the others, was not sponsored officially by any synod. The Joint Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan had the largest representation there—85 out of 205. The Rev. M. Bunge, a member of the Wisconsin Synod, was the leader in arranging the conference. Fifteen men each from the Iowa and the Ohio Synod attended; 62 were present from the Missouri Synod.¹²³ Prof. Francis Pieper lectured on the topic, "Die Grund-Differenzen in der Lehre von der Bekehrung und Gnadenwahl." In five points he gave the Missouri Synod teaching: (1) Scripture teaches that the reason for the conversion and the salvation of those who are actually converted and saved is solely the grace of God in Christ; (2) Scripture teaches that when some are not converted and are lost, it is solely the fault of man in resisting the work of the Spirit; (3)

¹²⁰ *Der Lutheraner*, XLVIII (March 1 1892), 41; *ibid.*, XLVIII (Oct. 25, 1892), 176. F. Pieper, "Zur kirchlichen Chronik," *ibid.*, XLVIII (March 29, 1892), 57; "Was sie zu Stande bringen wollen, ist nicht sowohl eine kirchliche Einigung der Lutheraner, als ein *Bund gegen Missouri*." (Italics in the original.)

¹²¹ *Idem*, "Vorwort," *Lehre und Wehre*, XLV (January 1899), 2, 3.

¹²² *Ibid.*, XLIX (May 1903), 142; *ibid.*, XLVIII (July and August 1902), 234, 235.

A free conference between pastors of the Michigan Synod and the Missouri Synod on June 12 and 13, 1904, in Jackson, Mich., found

accord on the conditions for fellowship and on open questions. F. Bente, "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, L (September 1904), 420 to 422, citing the *Bericht* of the conference published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, in 1904.

¹²³ F. Bente, "Die freie Konferenz von Watertown," "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, XLIX (May 1903), 142. Bente, however, gave the dates as May 29, 30.

What lies beyond these two truths belongs to the unfathomable ways of God; (4) There is no reasonable, logical (*vernunftgemäß*) answer to the question: *Cur alii prae aliis?* (5) The circumstance that the Gospel has not been preached to all peoples of all times does not contradict the truth of God's grace.¹²⁴

As a result of this conference a committee was elected to arrange another free conference. The conference was commended because it sought unity of spirit in doctrine, did not gloss over differences, but aimed at removing the differences for a God-pleasing unity. Unity was not thought of as being dependent on externals. Holy Scriptures (this was a basic assumption) must be the source and norm of all doctrines in agreement with the Lutheran Symbols.¹²⁵

¹²⁴ F. Pieper, "Freie Konferenz," "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, XLIX (May 1903), 143 f.

Idem, "Die Berichte über die Konferenz in Watertown," *Lehre und Wehre*, XLIX (May 1903), 129-132, defended himself against the report in the Lutheran, that he modified his (and the Missouri Synod's and the Synodical Conference's) position. He said (pp. 130, 131): "Ich habe in Watertown nichts modifiziert und nichts verdeckt, sondern unsere Stellung, wie ich sie seit 25 Jahren vertreten habe, unumwunden ins Licht gerückt."

F. Bente also found fault with Nicum's report in the Lutheran and cited other journals which did not agree with Nicum. "Die freie Konferenz in Watertown," "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, XLIX (July-August 1903), 232 f.

Pieper's essay was printed. *Die Grunddiffferenz in der Lehre von der Bekehrung und Gnadenwahl* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1903), 48 pages. F. Bente closed his review of the essay: "Diese Schrift Dr. Piepers ist ein Eirenicon im besten Sinne des Wortes." *Ibid.*, XLIX (October 1903), 301.

¹²⁵ F. Bente, *ibid.*, XLIX (May 1903), 142 f. Also see pp. 144, 145.

A second free conference was held in 1903, this one in Milwaukee, Sept. 9-11, attended by more than 700 persons. There were 500 persons who actually registered, of whom 377 belonged to the Synodical Conference. Two questions occupied this conference: "1. What is the relationship of the universal gracious will of God (*der allgemeine Gnadenwille Gottes*) to predestination (*Gnadenwahl*)? 2. Must those passages of Holy Writ, which *ex professo* deal with predestination (e. g., Eph. 1: 1-6, 2 Thess. 2: 13, Acts 13:48), be interpreted according to John 3: 16 and similar passages on universal grace?"¹²⁶ The debate revolved around principles of Scriptural interpretation. However, another free conference was scheduled for Detroit in 1904.¹²⁷

Between the Milwaukee and the Detroit conference a meeting of the Planning Committee was held in Chicago on Dec. 29, 1903. Present were: F. Pieper and G. Stoeckhardt, Missouri Synod; A. Hocnecke and A. Pieper, Wisconsin Synod; F. Richter and M. Fritschel, Iowa Synod; H. G. Stub, Norwegian Synod; H. A. Allwardt, H. Ernst, and F. W. Stelthorn, from the Ohio Synod. The Ohio Synod representatives wanted to make the 1877 theses (Northern District of the Missouri Synod) on the *analogia fidei* the subject of discussion, and the first two theses were actually discussed. The committee members agreed to formulate positions on this doctrine and to discuss the *analogia fidei* at the Detroit conference.¹²⁸

¹²⁶ Idem, "Die freie Konferenz in Milwaukee," "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, XLIX (October 1903), 304.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 304, 305.

¹²⁸ Idem, "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, L (January 1904), 35-37.

On April 5, 1904, this committee met again in Detroit prior to the conference. It set up two questions: 1. What is the analogy of faith? 2. How is the analogy of faith to be used? The two-day discussion in the free conference (April 1904) raged about these questions, the doctrines of election and conversion receiving references most frequently. In spite of lack of agreement the large assembly (about 500 men) voted to meet in Fort Wayne in the following year to discuss the doctrine of predestination.¹²⁹

The Detroit Free Conference did not have the opportunity to discuss the areas of agreement and disagreement regarding *analogia fidei* as set forth for each side respectively by Stellhorn (Ohio and Iowa) and by Pieper (Synodical Conference and Norwegian Synod). The committee, at the request of the Ohio Synod, had substituted the two general questions which were discussed.¹³⁰ Subsequently Pieper formulated sentences on hermeneutical principles in their relationship to the *analogia fidei*.¹³¹

In 1905 (Aug. S-10) the fourth of the free conferences was held. This one took place in Fort Wayne, attended by 200 to 300 men. Eph. 1 was discussed; this led to a discussion of Art. XI of the Formula of

¹²⁹ G. St[oekhardt], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, I (April 1904) 174—176. Average attendance, 500, of whom 305 were clergymen; 124 from the Missouri Synod, 10 from the Wisconsin Synod, 97 from the Ohio Synod, 23 from the Iowa Synod, etc.

¹³⁰ F. Plieperl, "Ueber die Analogie oder Regel des Glaubens," *ibid.*, L (September 1904), 405—410.

¹³¹ *Idem*, "Schriftauslegung und Analogie des Glaubens," *ibid.*, LII (November 1906), 481—486; *ibid.*, LIII (January 1907), 11—18; *ibid.*, LIII (February 1907), 70—77; *ibid.*, LIII (April 1907), 153-160; *ibid.*, LIII (December 1907), 529-534.

Concord. The issue was joined. Does this passage speak of God's universal plan of salvation or of God's eternal decree of election? No agreement was reached, although arrangements were made for another free conference in the coming year.¹³²

The Missourians, it was admitted, had little zeal for further meetings, because of the uncomplimentary reports circulated about their Synod. They were certain that the free conferences were not successful in convincing their opponents of the error of their position. Dr. Pieper was attacked by the Ohio church papers. However, the Missourians were reluctant to break off the conferences. "∴" Missouri was blamed for the 50 years of disunity in the Lutheran church since the organization of the General Council.¹³⁴ It was branded as a sect.¹³⁵

¹³² G. St[oekhardt], "Freie Konferenz in Fort Wayne," in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LI (August 1905), 368—372.

See *idem*, "Was lehrt St. Paulus Epheser 1:3-14 von der Gnadenwahl?" *ibid.*, LI (October 1905), 433—446; *ibid.*, LI (November 1905) 481—489.

F. B[ente], "Die intersynodale Konferenz in Fort Wayne," *ibid.*, LII (December 1906), 529 to 545; *ibid.*, LIII (January 1907), 18—33; *ibid.*, LIII (February 1907), 77—87.

See also *idem*, "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LIII (January 1907), 36—38.

F., "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LIII (March 1907), 127-129.

¹³³ *Idem*, "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LI (November 1905), 512, 513.

See *idem*, "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LI (August 1905), 373—375, for the attacks on Dr. Pieper's presidential report in Detroit, who found fault with the Ohio Synod for its position on conversion as synergistic and its *analogia fidei* doctrine. The Iowa Synod, too. F. B[ente] declared, was continually arousing hatred against Missouri.

Also see his [Bente's] "Vorwort," *ibid.*, LII, (January 1906), 1, 2.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 8.

The loose position on Scripture within the General Synod¹³⁶ and the refusal or inability to acknowledge the basic nature of the differences between Ohio and Missouri (analogy of faith, election, conversion) brought on, Bente stated, the charges against Missouri of causing the disunity in the Lutheran Church of America. Thus the failure of the free conferences led to new strictures of the Missouri Synod. Once more the doctrine of election was the subject of the debate and with it the question of the principles of Biblical interpretation.¹³⁷

Bente asked, "Wie kann die Einigkeit unter den Lutheranern in Amerika hergestellt werden?" He did not agree with the *Lutheran Observer* that the different Lutheran bodies were the various species within the genus Lutheranism. To agree on the universal in Lutheranism meant acceptance of the symbols. The Missouri Synod did not demand acquiescence in the inferences drawn from the symbols.¹³⁸

Deindoerfer of the Iowa Synod in 1904

¹³⁶ Ibid., LII (March 1906), 106—119; *ibid.*, LII (April 1906), 160—173; *ibid.*, LII (May 1906), 193—211. Also see F. B[ente], "Ohio-sche Entstellungen und Verleumdungen," *ibid.*, LII (May 1906), 226—228.

¹³⁷ G. St[oeckhardt], "Zum Schriftbeweis für die Lehre von der Gnadenwahl," *ibid.*, LII (July 1906), 289—303; *ibid.*, LII (August 1906), 337—345; *idem*, "Ein Nachtrag zum Dogmengeschichtlichen über die Lehre von der Gnadenwahl," *ibid.*, LII (September 1906), 385 to 399; *ibid.*, LII (October 1906), 433—446; [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LX (February 1914), 79—80.

¹³⁸ F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, XLIX (October 1903), 305, 306. He says, p. 306: "Die Missouri-Synode fordert keine Zustimmung zu bloßen Schlussfolgerungen, sondern ausgesprochenenmaßen nur zu solchen Lehren, von welchen sie bewiesen hat, dass sie ausdrücklich, *expressis verbis*, in Gottes Wort gelehrt werden."

detailed seven points of difference between Iowa and Missouri. Briefly summarized they pertained to the questions:

1. What constitutes a divisive doctrine?
2. What is the correct doctrine of the church?
3. What is the Scriptural doctrine of the ministry?
4. What about the teachings concerning Sunday?
5. What about eschatological questions? The Antichrist?
6. The millenium?
7. The first resurrection?

Soteriological questions and questions pertaining to conversion remained as major points of difference.¹³⁹

In the controversy with the Ohio Synod: Bente remarked: "Klare Bibelstellen machen auf die Ohioer und ohiosche Auslegungen machen auf Missouri keinen Eindruck."¹⁴⁰ Ohio limited the *sola gratia*, Bente maintained.¹⁴¹

There were other free conferences held after these four from 1903 to 1905. They were relatively unimportant. Those between the Missouri Synod pastors and the General Council pastors in the New York City area around 1909 died out, although the Missouri Synod pastors declared their

¹³⁹ G. St[oeckhardt], "Die Lehrdifferenzen zwischen Missouri und Iowa," *ibid.*, L (October 1904), 439—450; *ibid.*, L (November 1904), 488—49; *ibid.*, L (December 1904), 533 to 546; with reference to Stellhorn's "Weshalb versagt die lutherische Synode von Missouri (und ihre Bundesgenossen) der lutherischen Synode von Iowa die Kirchenpemeinschaft?" in the 1904 *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*.

¹⁴⁰ F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVI (May 1910), 226.

¹⁴¹ *Idem*, "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *ibid.*, LVI (July 1910), 314, 316.

willingness to further them.¹⁴² The question of unity preoccupied the Synodical Conference in these years,¹⁴³ without, however, bringing about steps toward union. During the period between the close of the Fort Wayne free conference (1905) and the convention of the Missouri Synod in 1917 the conviction came to the leaders of the Missouri Synod that free conferences and doctrinal essays at conventions would not be enough to further the cause of Lutheran union.

The free conferences, however, were by no means abandoned. Between 1914 and 1917 such conferences were held in widely separated places, seemingly without any concerted efforts to promote or co-ordinate their efforts. On June 25, 1914 (the 384th anniversary of the Augsburg Confession), a free conference was held in Baltimore. Lutheran pastors in and around Baltimore from the Synodical Conference, the Ohio Synod, and the General Synod were present for a discussion of Art. VII of the Augsburg Confession.¹⁴⁴ In May 1916 an important conversation was held between pastors of the Ohio and Iowa synods and of the Synodical Conference in St. Paul.

¹⁴² Ibid., LV (January 1909), 32; *ibid.*, LV (April 1909), 178.

¹⁴³ In 1908 Francis Pieper read the essay at the Synodical Conference convention on "Das herrliche Gut der glaubensbrüderlichen Gemeinschaft," *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1908, pp. 5—38; the essay in 1906, by J. Koehler, dealt with the theme, "Seid fleissig zu halten die Einigkeit im Geist," *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1906, pp. 5-40; in 1912 the opening sermon was delivered by Franz Pieper on Rom. 16: 16, 17, on the theme "Des Apostels Paulus Unterricht über die Trennung in der christlichen Kirche," *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1912, pp. 7-14.

¹⁴⁴ *Lutheran Witness*, XXXIII (July 28, 1914), 126.

The doctrines of conversion and election were the topics of conversation. The theses presented there, it was declared, were not, like the Norwegian *Opgjøer*, a compromise.¹⁴⁵ Yet the conferees did not arrive at a conclusive formulation (*abschliessende Formulierung*) of the doctrinal differences.¹⁴⁶ Again in 1917 a free conference was held in St. Paul;¹⁴⁷ in that year other conferences were held in Kansas¹⁴⁸ and Nebraska.¹⁴⁹ In the midst of these con-

¹⁴⁵ [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXII (September 1916), 423—426.

¹⁴⁶ F. Pieper, "Die St. Pauler Vereinigungsthesen," *ibid.*, LXIII (January 1917), I-6; *idem*, "Weiterc Verhandlungen über Vereinigungsthesen," *ibid.*, LXIII (March 1917), 97 to 102.

They were found defective, too, by the Ohio Synod *Theologische Zeitblätter*, December 1916, according to [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXIII (January 1917), 40.

Zur Einigung: Leitsätze, die auf der intersynodalen Konferenz in der ev. luth. Dreifaltigkeits-Kirche zu St. Paul, Minn., am 3. und 4. Mai 1916 angenommen wurden (publisher and date not given) has a roster of 555 names of men who subscribed to the "St. Paul Theses," distributed among the synods as follows: Iowa (167), Missouri (163), Minnesota (81), Ohio (65), Wisconsin (50), Michigan (6), Nebraska (3), and others whose affiliation is not identified.

¹⁴⁷ *Der Lutheraner*, LXXIII (April 24, 1917), 138; a notice to meet on May 9, 10.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., LXXIII (Aug. 28, 1917), 284; the notice was a call for the "second intersynodical conference in Kansas" to meet at Ellinwood, Sept. 11, 12. Another notice, almost a year later, called for the "second intersynodical conference of Kansas" to meet in Ellinwood from July 31 to Aug. 1, 1918. The discussion on the question, "Who are the elect according to the Formula of Concord!" was to be continued according to the notice.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., LXXIII (Oct. 23, 1917), 360; the notice stated that the "next intersynodical conference" would be held on Nov. 6 and 7, in Sterling, according to a resolution passed in

ferences Missouri's leading spokesman declared that setting aside the differences between the Synodical Conference on the one hand and the Ohio, Iowa, and other synods on the other hand ought to be easy if only the latter would acknowledge that nothing in man is responsible for his conversion.¹⁵⁰ He feared that these conferences tended to discuss so many theological questions extensively that the real issue, as he saw it, was at times obscured. The issue? The grace of God in conversion.¹⁵¹

For all that, the thought that the Missouri Synod and the Ohio-Iowa groups would unite was not a foreign one in 1917; it was bruited about in wider circles. The intersynodical conferences between 1914 and 1917 were regarded as being fruitful.¹⁵² It was then that Friedrich Bente asked the question, and the question became the title of a book, *Was steht der*

*Vereinigung der lutherischen Synoden Amerikas in 2 Wege?*¹⁵³ He surveyed the various Lutheran church bodies in America in their historical development and detailed the points of difference between each and the Missouri Synod. Bente's book caused a minor controversy, an editorial give-and-take between church papers of the Ohio Synod and the Missouri Synod.¹⁵⁴

The controversy was not of such a nature as to disrupt the steps toward formal union negotiations between Missouri and Wisconsin on the one hand and Ohio and Iowa on the other. The free conferences that were being held, especially in 1916 and 1917, exercised a strong influence, it may safely be said, in bringing about more official negotiations among the synods. Especially the intersynodical conferences in the Northwest (e. g., St. Paul on May 9, 1917) brought pressure on the Missouri Synod to elect an intersynodical committee to examine the theses proposed by such an intersynodical conference.¹⁵⁵ Thus, in 1917, the year of the Norwegian merger, two years before the Wisconsin Synod formally consolidated its forces, the year before the organization of the United Lutheran Church in America, the year in which union plans among the Lutherans in America were more prominent than in

Fremont. The meeting was to be held in an Iowa Synod church (H. E. Wunderlich, pastor). Three papers were scheduled on the topic "Who are the elect according to the Formula of Concord?"

¹⁵⁰ F. Pfeiffer, "Eine dreifache Frage und eine dreifache Antwort," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXII (November 1916), 481—484.

¹⁵¹ Idem, "Zur Einigung," *ibid.*, LXII (April 1916), 150; see pp. 145—150 for the discussion of Thesis XII of the Ohio Synod's *Zeugnisse zur Einigung*.

¹⁵² [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXIII (November 1917), 517—520. In the report of the 1917 convention of the Missouri Synod published in *Der Lutheraner*, LXXIII (July 3, 1917), 217, it was stated: "In den letzten Jahren sind besonders im Nordwesten auf privatem Wege Verhandlungen mit Gliedern der Iowasynode und Ohiosynode begonnen worden, die darauf abzielen, die bestehenden Lehrdifferenzen zu beseitigen. Diese Verhandlungen haben einen loblichen Zweck und sind auch bisher nicht ganz erfolglos gewesen. Sie haben aber einen solchen Umfang angenommen, dass sie nicht länger als Privatsache behandelt werden sollten."

¹⁵³ Published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, in 1917; 110 pages.

¹⁵⁴ [M.] Sommer, "One Preventive of Union," *Lutheran Witness*, X SXVI (May 29, 1917), 158, 159.

Nor part of the controversy but of some interest is the fact that J. Schaller of the Wisconsin Synod stated that he did not agree with all of Bente's conclusions, but did not detail his points of disagreement. *Theologische Quartalschrift*, XIV (April 1917), 171.

¹⁵⁵ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1917, Germ. ed., pp. 153, 154; Engl. ed., pp. 76, 77.

any year before 1959, the Missouri Synod had its first unity or union committee. The committee was named by that name; it was regarded, if not so named, as the Committee on Intersynodical Matters. Geo. Mezger, J. G. F. Kleinhans, and O. L. Hohenstein were elected (by ballot) to the committee. They were instructed to "be prepared to treat with similar committees representing other Lutheran Synods."¹⁵⁶ It may be noted that Pieper was not elected to this committee nor was any member of the Springfield faculty.

The other synods also elected or appointed committees for intersynodical relations. The committees of the respective synods (Iowa, Ohio, Missouri, and Wisconsin) held a meeting in St. Paul on Feb. 6, 7, 1918, and agreed to meet again from July 23 to 25 in Milwaukee.¹⁵⁷ A series of six meetings was held between 1917 and the 1920 Detroit convention of the Missouri Synod. The Intersynodical Board (*Intersynodale Kommission*) — the official title of the committee elected in 1917 — reported that ten theses on conversion had been agreed on. Progress was being made toward agreement in the doctrine of election, but agreement had not yet been achieved. The Synod was ready to continue these meetings and expressed a prayer for unity with the Ohio and Iowa synods.¹⁵⁸

The Committee on Intersynodical Matters reported that our committee and the committee of the Wisconsin Synod has since 1918 carried on doctrinal discussions with

committees of the Ohio Synod and of the Iowa Synod, and that agreement in the doctrine of conversion had been reached. This report was received with joy, and it was voted that the discussions be continued on such other points of doctrine as are still in controversy.¹⁵⁹

Synod resolved also that the theses were to be printed and discussed in the conferences of the Synod. The same committee was re-elected to carry on the negotiations with the other synods.¹⁶⁰ The Ohio Synod, too, expressed its joy over the progress made and resolved to spread the theses on which agreement had been reached on its minutes.¹⁶¹ Optimism, therefore, in 1920, was not altogether out of order. Buffalo and Iowa had reached agreement; Iowa and Ohio had arrived at that point earlier; Missouri and Wisconsin had reached accord with Ohio and Iowa on the doctrine of conversion. "Are we too sanguine if we hope that, the better our position is known," it was said, "the greater the number of our friends will become? — that in the end a majority of all Lutherans will enter into relations of fellowship with us on the basis of the Lutheran Confessions?"¹⁶²

Between 1920 and 1923 three or four meetings were held annually by the representatives of the five synods (Wisconsin, Iowa, Ohio, Buffalo, and Missouri). Their work was slow; no attempt was made to

¹⁵⁹ [Th.] G [raebner], "The Story of the Convention," *Lutheran Witness*, XXXIX (July 6, 1920), 213.

¹⁶⁰ E. E., "Bericht über unsere Delegatensynode," *Der Lutheraner*, LXXVI (July 13, 1920), 233.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., LXXVI (Sept. 21, 1920), 312.

¹⁶² [Th.] G [raebner], "Prospects for Lutheran Church Union," *Lutheran Witness*, XXXIX (Sept. 14, 1920), 294.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ *Der Lutheraner*, LXXIV (Feb. 26, 1918), 84.

¹⁵⁸ Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1920, Germ. ed., pp. 239—241 (the report of the committee in full); Engl. ed., pp. 83, 84.

gloss over doctrinal differences. The doctrines of conversion and election were at the center of the discussions.

Wir können die Sachlage so zusammenfassen: Zu wahrer Einigung in der christlichen Lehre von der Bekehrung und Gnadenwahl gehört unzweideutig festzustellen, ob man in dem Satz von der "gleichen Schuld" und dem "gleich üblen Verhalten" einig ist, wenn die Menschen, welche bekehrt und selig werden, mit den Menschen, welche unbekehrt bleiben und verloren gehen, verglichen werde. . . . Wenn man diese beiden Menschenklassen miteinander vergleiche, müsse man ganz notwendig lehren, dass Bekehrung und Seligkeit *nicht* allein von Gottes Gnade, sondern auch von seinem "verschiedenen Verhalten," seiner Selbstbestimmung, seiner Selbstsetzung, seiner geringeren Schuld, seiner Unterlassung des mutwilligen Widerstrebens usw. abhängen.¹⁶³

Earlier, unionistic practices were regarded as "the chief hindrance to unity among Lutherans in America."¹⁶⁴ Now also it was said, "No union without unity."¹⁶⁵ Again: "The cause for disunion in the Lutheran

Church is found in false doctrine and harmful, destructive practices based upon this false teaching."¹⁶⁶

The Intersynodical Committee with the corresponding committees of the other synods, in the meanwhile, agreed on theses and antitheses regarding the doctrines of conversion and election. However, a number of protests were lodged against them at the convention of the Missouri Synod in 1923. A *Prüfungskommission*, so designated by the Synod, was elected and was given until the end of 1925 to examine and judge these theses and antitheses. In the meanwhile the Intersynodical Committee was to continue its discussions with the other synods.¹⁶⁷ Th. Graebner replaced Hohenstein on this committee; Kleinhans continued to serve.¹⁶⁸ Mezger, although reappointed to this committee, could not serve because of his transfer to Germany and was replaced by Wm. Arndt.¹⁶⁹ Th. Engelder, R. Neitzel, professors at Concordia Theological Seminary in Springfield, and Pastor P. Schulz of Springfield were elected to the *Prüfungskommission*.¹⁷⁰

Discussion of the differences was regarded as the only way in which agreement between Lutheran bodies could be achieved. The Intersynodical Committee and unofficial conferences were helpful toward this end. In 1923 a note of quiet but genuine optimism was still discernible

¹⁶³ F. Pfeifer], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXVII (July 1921), 214.

¹⁶⁴ [Th.] G[raebner], "Why Lutherans Cannot Unite," *Lutheran Witness*, XXXVI (Jan. 9, 1917), 6; idem, "The Greatest Hindrance to Lutheran Unity," *ibid.*, XXXVI (Feb. 20, 1917), 54 f.; idem, "Why Lutherans Cannot Unite," *ibid.*, XXXVI (Aug. 21, 1917), 263 ("Unionism is a bar to true unity"); idem, "Unionism Defined," *ibid.*, XXXVII (Oct. 29, 1918), 346 ("It [unionism] lays the ax at the root of Lutheran church life").

¹⁶⁵ [M.] S[ommer], "Union Without Unity," *ibid.*, XXXVI (Dec. 25, 1917), 406; [Th.] G[raebner], "Unionism Without Unity Is Treason," *ibid.*, XL (March 29, 1921), 104; [Wm.] A[rndt], "The Aim of the Synodical Conference: Unity Rather than Union," *ibid.*, XLI (July 4, 1922), 216.

¹⁶⁶ [M.] S[ommer], "Who Is Guilty of Keeping Lutherans Apart?" *ibid.*, XLII (Jan. 2, 1923), 5.

¹⁶⁷ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1923, Germ. ed., pp. 223-229; Engl. ed., p. 92.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.* Germ. ed., p. 240; Engl. ed., p. 92.

¹⁶⁹ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1926, Germ. ed., p. 223; Engl. ed., p. 136.

¹⁷⁰ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1923, Germ. ed., p. 229.

-agreement might be reached between the Ohio and Iowa synods and the Synodical Conference.¹⁷¹ There was a readiness even to stress the fact that doctrinal differences still existed. A "Lutheran Forum," for instance, in Chicago heard William Dallmann speak on "Things Which Disunite" in October 1924.¹⁷² In this same year Pieper delivered an essay at the Oregon and Washington District of the Missouri Synod on "Unionism." He said:

Holy Scriptures teach very emphatically and in manifold ways that all fellow-ship (*sic*) with false doctrine is forbidden of God and detrimental to the Church.¹⁷³

In applying this proposition he rejected union with the, Reformed denominations, "both such as teach that God does not desire the salvation of ail men, as well as those that maintain that God does not by grace alone wish to save and convert men." Then he added: "It is a regrettable fact that the latter false doctrine has found

a home within the Lutheran Church. . . ."¹⁷⁴ He said that "certain elements within the American Lutheran Church espouse this error [that the conversion of man is not brought about solely by the gracious operation of God, but that the co-operation of man is essential] with such determination that they have not refrained from branding the Missouri Synod and affiliated synods Calvinists. . . ."¹⁷⁵

The question of church union was aired also from the pulpits of the Missouri Synod during this period (1917—1932). Paul Lindemann, for instance, wrote:

The wave of unionistic tendencies which has swept over our country and over the world is plainly of satanic origin. It is one of the two methods of Satan to despoil the Church of Christ. . . . Every union that is not based on a unity of faith has in every case proved disastrous, and all its splendid promises have turned out to be vain delusions.¹⁷⁶

Unionism, Theo. Graebner wrote, violates the clearness of Scripture. A unionistic Lutheran makes of Lutheranism a sect.¹⁷⁷ Unionism was condemned in an article in *THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* by William Arndt.¹⁷⁸ He pointed out: "That the question of unionism has been one of the chief

¹⁷¹ [Th.] G[raebner], "Lutheran Union," *Lutheran Witness*, XLII (Aug. 14, 1923), 263. He said: "For this purpose {to bring about agreement} our Synod has an Intersynodical Committee. For this purpose, too, unofficial conferences between out men and the representatives of other bodies have been held and are being held. These negotiations have not been without blessed result, and the hope is bright for the removal of differences which have been a cause of schism and disunion."

Also see [M.] S[ommer], "'Ohio,' 'Iowa,' and 'Missouri,'" *ibid.*, XLII (Oct. 23, 1923), 341: "Entire agreement has not yet been achieved, because all the points of controversy have not been fully discussed, but progress has been made, and the effort will be continued."

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, XLIII (Nov. 18, 1924), 420.

¹⁷³ F. Pieper, *Unionism: What Does the Bible Say about Church-Union?* trans. J. A. Rimbach and E. H. Brandt (Oregon City, Oreg.: Oregon City Enterprise for the Oregon and Washington District of the Missouri Synod, [1925]), p. 5. In italics in the original.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10. In italics in the original.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁷⁶ Paul Lindemann, "Church Union," A sermon delivered at the convention of the Norwegian Synod, June 6, 1920, at Minneapolis, Minn., on John 10: 16, *Magazin für evang.-luth. Homiletik und Pastoraltheologie*, XLIV (October 1920), 465 f.

¹⁷⁷ [Th.] G[raebner], "Letters to a Young Preacher," Tenth Letter, *Magazin für evang.-luth. Homiletik und Pastoraltheologie*, XLIV (December 1920), 566.

¹⁷⁸ W. Arndt, "The Lutheran Church and Unionism," *Theological Monthly*, VI (November 1926), 321—328.

rocks on which the past hopes for unification of the Lutheran Church in America came to grief is well known."¹⁷⁹ "Unionism is not only one of the chief obstacles to Lutheran harmony, it is one of the greatest evils that are harassing the body of Christ these days."¹⁸⁰

Just at this time, between 1923 and 1926, the Ohio and Iowa Synods advanced toward organic union—a union that was consummated also with the Buffalo Synod in the formation of the American Lutheran Church in 1930. The initiative had come from the Iowa Synod in 1919. A year later a joint committee got to work; in 1922 a larger committee came into being, which drew up detailed plans for an organic union. The recommendation for such a merger came in 1924. In 1925 the Buffalo Synod voiced a readiness to join with Iowa and Ohio. In 1926, however, the demands of the Iowa Synod for a change in wording of the confessional paragraph caused a delay in effecting the union.¹⁸¹

Some good might come out of the efforts to unite the Iowa and the Ohio synods, Pieper declared, after the Ohio Synod had rejected this proposed amendment to the doctrinal paragraph of the proposed constitution.

Aus den neuen Vereinigungsbestrebungen kann etwas Gutes kommen, wenn sie erneute Untersuchungen darüber veranlassen, was wirklich lutherische Lehre ist und was bisher noch immer fälschlich dafür ausgegeben wurde.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 322.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 327.

¹⁸¹ Wentz, *Lutheranism in America*, pp. 298, 299.

¹⁸² F. Pieper in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXXII (October

The Missouri Synod leaders were more concerned, however, by the fact that these synods were negotiating with the Norwegian Lutheran Church and had agreed on the *Minneapolis Theses* in 1925. These theses dealt with the following topics: the Scriptures; the Lutheran Symbols; Church Fellowship; the Chicago Theses of 1919 (the work of Christ, the Gospel, absolution, Baptism, justification, faith, conversion, and election j; the lodge question; and a declaration of mutual recognition.¹⁸³

Meetings were continued also between the representatives of the Synodical Conference and of the Ohio and Iowa Synods (but not the Norwegian Lutheran Church). When the Missouri Synod committee reported to the convention in St. Louis in 1926 it could state that agreement had been reached with the committees of these synods on many points: the doctrines of the Scriptures (deemed necessary because of its importance for unity, although no controversy had raged on this point except on the question of *analogia fidei*), attitude toward the Confessions, church fellowship, the church, the spiritual priesthood, the ministry, Antichrist, chiliasm, Sunday, and open questions. The adequacy of these theses was to be Synod's decision on the basis of the report of the Examining Committee. In any eventuality continued discussions with the other Synods were urged.¹⁸⁴

The convention rejoiced over the prog-

1926), 310. Cf. *ibid.*, LXXII (November 1926), 342, 343 re these differences.

¹⁸³ Doctrinal Declarations, pp. 20—23; Bruce, pp. 8 I—Si; *Theological Monthly*, VII (April 1927), 112—117.

¹⁸⁴ Proceedings, Mo. Synod, 1926, Germ. ed., pp. 223, 224.

ress which had been made. It found that "the Lutheran doctrine has not yet in all points received such expression as is clear, precise, adequate, and exclusive of all error." Pastoral conferences were to study them. It re-elected the personnel of the Intersynodical Committee, with instructions to remove other obstacles toward unity and union, among them the differing concept of Christian fellowship.¹⁸⁵ This convention also heard the report of the Examining Committee, which had been appointed to review the products of the Intersynodical Committee. It recommended about 24 changes, both in the theses on conversion and election submitted in 1923 and the additional theses agreed on between 1923 and 1926. It found these changes "necessary" (*notig*).¹⁸⁶

With the encouragement of the convention the Missouri Synod Intersynodical Committee (Th. Engelder had replaced Th. Graebner) continued meeting with the committees of the other synods. The revisions of the Missouri Synod *Prüfungskomitee* were presented to this joint committee. Most of them were accepted; none were rejected for doctrinal reasons. Important additions were made, especially a section treating election *intuitu fidei*, and one expanding the section on chiliasm.¹⁸⁷ The final formation was the well-known "Chicago, Theses Concerning Conversion, Predestination, and Other Doctrines," adopted by representatives of the Buffalo, Iowa, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin

synods, and revised and formally adopted on Aug. 2, 1928, in St. Paul.¹⁸⁸

Dissatisfaction with the *Chicago Theses* developed within the Missouri Synod. Pieper feared that they harbored "*verschiedenes Verhalten*," i.e., that the difference in conversion can be accounted for by the variant dispositions in different people.¹⁸⁹ Other voices were raised in more decided disagreement.

When the Intersynodical Committee reported to the Missouri Synod convention in 1929 it made no specific recommendation for adoption or rejection of the *Chicago Theses*. It did recommend that the action on the theses be separated from the question of fraternal relations with Iowa, Ohio, and Buffalo, because of the ties the latter had made *mit nicht bekennnistreuen Lutheranern*.¹⁹⁰

So, too, in spite of the declaration of altar and pulpit fellowship by the Ohio and Norwegian synods on the basis of the *Minneapolis Theses*, John Meyer of the

¹⁸⁵ A. C. Haase, secretary, "Schlussbericht des Intersynodalkomitees," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, XXV (October 1928), 266; see pp. 266—288. The English version is *ibid.*, XXVI (October 1929), 250—273. The German text was declared the official text. They were reprinted separately in both the German and the English. The English version can be found conveniently in *Doctrinal Declarations*, pp. 24—59.

¹⁸⁹ F. Pieper, "Vorwort," *Lehre und Wehre*, LXXIII (January and February, 1927), 3: "Ein Versuch zur Beseitigung dieser Plage ist in der jüngsten Zeit wieder in den sogenannten 'Intersynodalen Thesen' gemacht worden, die von den Vertretern der Synodalkonferenz einerseits und von Vertretern der Synoden von Iowa, Ohio und Buffalo andererseits zusammengestellt sind. Sie sind zu genauer Prüfung an die genannten Kirchenkörper verwiesen worden."

¹⁹⁰ *Reports and Memorials*, Mo. Synod, 1929, p. 131.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 227-229; Engl. ed., pp. I 40 f.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, Germ. ed., pp. 225, 226; Engl. ed., pp. 135—137.

¹⁸⁷ *Reports and Memorials*. Mo. Synod, 1929, pp. 130, 131.

Wisconsin Synod asked that the Chicago Theses "be prayerfully considered on their own merit."¹⁹¹ He said of the committee's work:

In heilsamem Horror vor aller Union-isterei war das Komitee stets bestrebt, jeden Ausdruck, der etwa zweideutig erscheinen konnte, zu vermeiden, so dass die resultierende These immer von allen im gleichen Sinn verstanden wurde und in ihrem klaren Wortlaut das Herzensbekenntnis eines jedes Komiteegliedes ist. Der Segen des Herrn blieb den Bemühungen des Komitees nicht versagt. Das lebendige Wort unsers Gottes bewies seine einigende Kraft. Der Heilige Geist, der die ganze Christenheit auf Erden sammelt, trieb sein Werk der Einigung mit Macht in den Herzen der Komiteeglieder, so dass sie sich zusammenfanden in dem wahren Glauben und nun mit den angenommenen Thesen ein einmütiges Bekenntnis vor der Kirche ablegen.¹⁹²

However, the Examining Committee (Neitzel, Schulz, Wenger) of the Missouri Synod found itself "compelled to advise Synod to reject these theses as a possible basis for union with the synods of Ohio, Iowa, and Buffalo, since all chapters and a number of paragraphs are inadequate." The insertion of the paragraph on *intuitu fidei*, for instance, made that chapter "less clear than it was before." The report of this committee concluded:

Your Committee considers it a hopeless undertaking to make these theses unobjectionable from the view of pure doctrine.

¹⁹¹ "Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, XVI (January 1929), 58. Meyer's plea for "an unbiased examination of the Chicago Theses" was endorsed in *Theological Monthly*, IX (March 1929), 81.

¹⁹² [John] M[eyer], "Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, XXV (October 1928), 288.

It would be better to discard them as a failure. It now seems to your Committee a matter of wisdom to desist from intersynodical conferences. *By entering into a closer relationship with the adherents of the Norwegian "Opgjøer," the opponents have given evidence that they do not hold our position in the doctrines of conversion and election.* In view of this action further conferences would be useless and only create the impression as if (*sic*) we were endeavoring to come to an understanding, which is not the case.

It ought now also to be apparent that the manner of conducting these conferences, to wit, the exclusion of all historical matters, is wrong (*keine weise war*). As a result the opponents hardly understand each other.¹⁹³

The Northeast Special Conference of Iowa [of the Missouri Synod] protested against the inadequacies of the theses and found them "unserviceable for purposes of union." This group, too, wanted to break off entirely from further conferences.¹⁹⁴ Other documents and letters which dealt with the reports of these two committees were also on hand.

The Committee on Intersynodical Matters of the 1929 (River Forest) convention of the Missouri Synod — Committee 19 — acknowledged that "some progress in the presentation of doctrine on the basis of the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confes-

¹⁹³ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1927, pp. 110 to 112; the quotation is from p. 112. Italics added. The German report, which is much smoother than the English, is in *Reports and Memorials*, Mo. Synod, 1929, pp. 131—134.

The Chicago Theses will be examined in more detail in Section IV of this essay.

¹⁹⁴ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1927, p. 112; *Reports and Memorials*, 1927, p. 134, where the protest is given in full in German.

sions has been made." In other respects, too, it toned down, as best it could, the raspiness of the report of the Examining Committee. Committee 19 did not, however, recommend the acceptance of the Chicago **Theses**. Nor did it recommend that all negotiations be broken off. It recommended that a committee be appointed by the President of Synod "to formulate theses which, beginning with the *status controversiae*, are to present the doctrine of the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions in the shortest, most simple manner." In other words, this committee was to draw up a brief statement on doctrines in controversy. The recommendations of Committee 19 were adopted. The report stated:

It was emphasized that future discussion be contingent on the following two conditions:

a) That the move toward fellowship between the Ohio and Iowa synods, on the one hand, and the Norwegian Lutheran Church, on the other, be first adjusted according to the Word of God;

b) That future deliberations proceed from the exact point of controversy and take into account the pertinent **history**.¹⁹⁵

Between 1929 and 1932, therefore, there **were no** intersynodical conferences. Unilateral action was taken to formulate **A Brief Statement** by the committee appointed by President Pfotenhauer. This committee consisted of F. Pieper, W. Wenger, E. A. Mayer, L. A. Heerboth, and Th. Engelder. With only a few stylistic changes and with the elevation of the English version to co-equal official position with the German, the theses were adopted in 1932

"as a brief Scriptural statement of the doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod." ¹⁹⁶

The Synodical Conference as such was not involved in the conferences and theses of the years 1917 to 1929, although the Wisconsin Synod representatives participated. Nor did the Synodical Conference accept **A Brief Statement-it** was never asked to do so.

Now 29 years later, in almost another generation and in the midst of another round of union movements, it has become a symbol of controversy within the church body that fathered it.

We must look at its period of literary gestation before we can conclude.

IV

MAJOR DOCTRINAL FORMULATIONS WITHIN THE MISSOURI SYNOD 1887-1932

Only against the backdrop of the movements within the Missouri Synod, major theological movements of the period and Missouri's reaction to them, and the developments within Lutheranism in America can the form and phraseology of the **Brief Statement** of 1932 be understood. The literary genesis of this document must also be considered. What does it owe to its predecessors, if any? Who is its major author?

The second question can be answered very simply. It was **Francis Pieper**, professor of theology at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, from 1878 **to** 1931 and its president from 1887 to 1931. After the death of Dr. C. F. W. **Walther** he was regarded as the "Elisha" on whom Walther's mantle had fallen. His **essays** at synodical and dis-

¹⁹⁵ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1929, pp. 112, 123.

¹⁹⁶ *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1932, pp. 154, 155.

strict conventions and in *Lehre und Wehre*, his shorter treatises, and then his *Christliche Dogmatik* substantiated his prestige as a theologian. His duties as president of Concordia Seminary and as President of the Missouri Synod from 1899 to 1911, his activities within the Synodical Conference, his membership on various boards and committees made it mandatory for him to be a churchman as well as a theologian. He, then, was the chief author of *A Brief Statement*.¹

He was also the author of other doctrinal formulations that preceded the *Brief Statement*. These are "*Ich glaube, darum rede ich*"² (1897) and *Was die Synode von Missouri, Ohio und andern Staaten während ihres fünfundsiebzigjährigen Bestehens gelehrt hat und noch lehrt* (1922).³ The first of these was issued in a second unaltered edition;⁴ it was translated into English when first published.⁵ These are direct progenitors of *A Brief Statement*

of 1932. Two other formulations must also be noted. Both are from the pen of Francis Pieper; both appeared in 1893. The one is the essay read at the convention of the Missouri Synod, giving a survey of the doctrine and practice of the Synod.⁶ 'The second is in English, a contribution to a symposium on the distinctive doctrines of the individual Lutheran church bodies in America.'

In his '1893 synodical essay Pieper began with the position of the Missouri Synod toward the Holy Scriptures. He noted the attacks on Holy Scriptures.

Die heilige Schrift soll nicht m & r d a s unfehlbare Gotteswort sein, dem sich alles, was Mensch heisst, im Glaubensgehorsam zu unterwerfen hat, sondern ein Buch, das auch irrige Menschenmeinungen enthalte, an dem daher die Menschen Kritik üben könnten und müssten.⁸

He called this position to the Scriptures *gottlos*.⁹ Higher criticism was treated, in Pieper's own phrase, without a compliment.¹⁰ The doctrine of God was discussed

¹ I. Fuerbringer, "F. Pieper als Theolog," CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, II (October 1931), 721—729; *ibid.*, II (November 1931), 801—807; W. H. T. Dau, "Dr. Francis Pieper, the Churchman," *ibid.*, II (October 1931), 729—736; T. Laetsch, "D. Pieper als Prediger," *ibid.*, II (October 1931), 761 to 771.

² The subtitle is: "Eine kurze Darstellung der Lehrstellung der Missouri-Synode. Zum Jubiläumsjahr 1897." Presumably this was published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1897, although these data are not given.

³ St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1922.

⁴ St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1903.

⁵ Francis Pieper, *A Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod, in the Year of Jubilee, 1897*, translated from the German by W. H. T. Dau (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House [1897]).

⁶ Francis Pieper, "Überblick über unsere Stellung in Lehre und Praxis, welche wir als Synode dem uns umgebenden Irrthum und Missbrauch gegenüber einnehmen," *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1893, pp. 26—53.

⁷ The six essays in the volume are by M. Loy on the Ohio Synod, M. Valentine on the General Synod, S. Fritschel on the Iowa Synod, H. E. Jacobs on the General Council, E. 'I'. Horn on the United Synod of the South, and F. Pieper on the Synodical Conference. See F. Pieper, "The Synodical Conference," *The Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the General Bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States* (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1893), pp. 117-166.

⁸ Pieper, "Überblick," *Proceedings*. Mo. Synod, 1893, pp. 26, 27.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

by him before he proceeded to a discussion of the doctrines of conversion, justification, election, and the church. He talked about the visible and the invisible church as well as orthodox and heterodox church bodies. Chiliasm and the Antichrist came in for treatment, the latter longer than the former. Under "*practice" he discussed church discipline and the position of the Missouri Synod toward the union movement (*Ver-einigungsbestrebungen*) of the day. He referred briefly to Missouri's position on lodges.¹¹

The second of his essays in 1893, this in English -possibly translated by W. H. T. Dau, although this is nowhere stated—borrowed heavily from the first, and it was in some respects a simple rewrite of the German essay. The German essay had about 13,000 words; the English, about 10,000. It brought out in an evangelical fashion the points on which the Missouri Synod differed from other Lutheran church bodies.

Pieper began this English essay with a discussion of the doctrine of the church. He defined the term and showed the importance of the doctrine. He spoke of the invisible and the visible church, the universal church and particular churches, orthodox and heterodox churches. The "Four Points" commanded his attention: chiliasm, pulpit fellowship, altar fellowship, and secret societies. Then he turned to the doctrine of the ministerial office; under this caption he included the topic of ordination, the right of judging on questions of doctrine, the obedience due to the ministerial office, and the relation of synods to congregations. "Of Church-Union" was the cap-

tion of the next major division, after which Pieper turned to the topic "On 'Open Questions.'" He dealt with the position of the Synodical Conference on the questions of Sunday, the Antichrist, and absolution before he turned to the major doctrines of justification, conversion, and predestination. This last doctrine received rather extensive treatment, including "objections to this doctrine" and the assurance of election.¹²

The doctrine of predestination was treated more extensively in the English essay than in the German one. The "Four Points," too, received more extensive treatment in the former. Oddly, it may seem, the doctrine of Scripture was not treated in the English essay, although it had been treated first in the German essay. Of thirteen major topics treated in the two essays five were treated in both; three in the German essay only; five in the English essay only.

However, the parallels and the differences between *A Brief Statement* of 1897 and *A Brief Statement* of 1932 are of greater significance. The 1922 version has some variations in language, but it is not as significant as either the 1897 or the 1932 document. All of the topics treated in the 1897 document were treated also in the 1922 and 1932 statements; the 1932 took up four other topics, of which three had been treated by Pieper in his 1893 English essay. Table II provides an overview of the topics treated in each of the presentations.¹³

¹² Pieper, "The Synodical Conference," *Distinctive Doctrines and Usages*, passim.

¹³ G-1893 is the document referred to in footnote 6; E-1893 is the document referred to in 7.

¹¹ Ibid., passim.

Table II

TOPICS TREATED IN FIVE MISSOURI
SYNOD DOCTRINAL STATEMENTS
1887-1932

	G 1893	E 1893	1897	1922	1932
Of the Holy Scriptures	X		x	x	x
Of God	X		x	x	x
Of Creation			x	x	x
Of Man and Sin			x	x	x
Of Redemption			x	x	x
Of Faith in Christ			x	x	x
Of Conversion	x	x	x	x	x
Of Justification	x	x	x	x	x
Of Good Works			x	x	x
Of the Means of Grace			x	x	x
Of the Election of Grace	x	x	x	x	x
Of the Church	X	X	X	X	X
Of the Public Ministry		X	X	X	X
Of the Millennium			x	x	x
Of the Antichrist	x	x	x	x	x
Of Church and State			x	x	x
Of Sunday		X			X
Of Open Questions		X			X
Of the Symbols of the Lutheran Church					X
Of Church Fellowship		X			X
Of Church Discipline	X				
Of Absolution		X			

To give a detailed textual criticism of the 1897, the 1922, and the 1932 documents would seem to serve little purpose. One illustration might suffice, that on the article on justification. The 1932 document adds the clause "that God has already declared the whole world to be righteous in Christ, Rom. 7: 19; 2 Cor. 5: 18-21; Rom. 4:25; . . ." Instead of saying (as did the 1897 and 1922 statements), "who believe in Christ, that is, believe that for Christ's sake their sins are forgiven," the 1932 version says, "who believe in Christ, that is, believe, accept, and rely on {*darin beruhen*}, the fact that for Christ's sake their sins are forgiven." ¹⁴ There are one or two other variations. The greatest variation

comes in the last paragraph. Here the 1932 reading is different in its **phraseology** throughout, noting the Unitarians and the synergists specifically and condemning those, too, who "again mix human works into the **article** of justification by ascribing to **man** a cooperation with God in the kindling of faith. . . ." ¹⁵ Thus in including "objective justification" and warning against the *Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Verhaltens* it was meeting two of the issues that had been raised since 1887.

A Brief Statement of 1932 was not intended to be a summary of the beliefs held by the Missouri Synod, at least not according to the 1929 resolutions. It became that in effect because it relied so heavily on the 1897 statement with the *appendage* of four sections. The intention was that it should deal primarily with the questions which were in *statu controversiae*. Since the resolutions came in connection with the rejection of the Chicago Theses, it would seem that the new document should set forth in detail the Missouri Synod on the points on which there was disagreement with these theses. Such was not the case, however. **A Brief Statement** of 1932 weaves into an existing document the doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod on questions that had been discussed in the years following the original framing of that document. So, for instance, the article on the Scriptures brings an echo of the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy, the article on creation reflects opposition to evolutionism, the article on justification repudiates those who deny *universalis gratia*.

The question remains, In how far did

1* Paragraph 17.

¹⁵ Paragraph 19.

A Brief Statement deal with the same questions with which the *Chicago Theses* dealt? Again, a tabular overview may be helpful in arriving at a quick, satisfactory answer. Table III makes it evident that the doctrines of conversion and election,

Table ZZZ

COMPARISON OF A BRIEF
STATEMENT (1932) WITH THE CHICAGO
THESES (1928)

Topic	Chicago Theses	Brief Statement
Of the Holy Scriptures	D, 1-3	1-3
Of God		4
Of Creation		5
Of Man and of Sin	A, 1 *	6, 7
Of Redemption	B, 1-4 †	8
Of Faith in Christ		9
Of Conversion	A, 1-10	10-16
Of Justification	B, 1-4 †	17-19
Of Good Works		20
Of Means of Grace		21-23
Of the Church	D, 14-15	24-27
On Church Fellowship	D, 9-13	28-29
The Spiritual Priesthood	D, 16-17	30
Of the Public Ministry	D, 18-20	31-33
Of Church and State		3 4
Of the Election of Grace	C, 1-8	35-40
Of Sunday	D, 25-26	4 1
Of the Millennium	D, 23-24	42
Of the Antichrist	D, 21-22	4 3
Of Open Questions	D, 27-29	44
Of the Symbols of the Lutheran Church	D, 4-8	45-48

quite properly, bulked largest in both documents. Almost 50 per cent of the space in *A Brief Statement* and 75 per cent of

the space in the Chicago *Theses* was occupied by these two doctrines. In view of the happenings from 1880 to 1928 this was not altogether surprising. What is surprising is that *A Brief Statement* deals with topics with which the Chicago *Theses* are not concerned. Even more surprising, at least to some individuals, is the lack of any direct refutation — if refutation was needed — of the Chicago *Theses*. However, *A Brief Statement* is a ~~o~~ ¹ to the total theological climate of ~~ts~~ ¹ ~~ts~~ ¹ to the late 1920s, particularly to the events in Lutheranism in America.

The 1897 document spoke in more universal tones — it does not need to be read in reverse to see the questions to which it was addressed — than did the 1932 document. It spoke with an evangelical, confessional voice, but it was not a polemical product. The 1897 *Brief Statement*, in the opinion of the present writer, answers the need of the 1960s better than does its 1932 offspring, because it has less of an *ad hoc* character. The 1932 document seems to him an illustration of pouring new wine into old bottles. The church might have been served better if modifications had been made in the Chicago *Theses* where they may have been necessary. Be that as it may. If the 1932 *Brief Statement* is indeed a product of the Middle Period of the Missouri Synod, can it serve as an adequate statement of her beliefs at the close of the third period of her history?

St. Louis, Mo.

* Section A is headed "Conversion."

† Section B is headed "Universal Will of Grace."